

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. XVI

FEBRUARY, 1945

No. 2

The Marburg Colloquy of 1529: A Textual Study

Sources

The primary sources on the Marburg Colloquy are comparatively numerous. While an official transcript of the proceedings was not kept, certain observers took notes and immediately after the conference supplemented these notes with the material they had retained in their memories. All of the sources are untranslated and are found in either German or Latin.

The most valuable and the most complete account of the Colloquy is the *Itinerarium Hedios*. Hedio was a Zurich theologian who accompanied Zwingli to Marburg. His account was written on the basis of copious notes taken during the debate. The account is subjective, patently championing the cause of the Swiss. The original has been lost, but copies are found in the Weimar Edition of Luther's Works,¹⁾ in Koehler's classic work on the Marburg Colloquy,²⁾ and in *Die Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte*.³⁾

The account of Rudolph Collin, professor of Greek at Zurich, ranks second in importance. Some scholars, particularly Erichson, are of the opinion that Hedio and Collin met immediately after the Colloquy or during the recesses and supplemented each other's notes. Kidd,⁴⁾ the Weimar Edition, and Koehler have copies of Collin's account.

Not as complete as the above-mentioned, but not wholly lacking in value is the account of the so-called Anonymous. He states that his words are a *quodam qui interfuit*. The author is evidently

1) *D. Martin Luthers Werke*, Weimar, 1910, Band 30, Dritte Abteilung.

2) Walther Koehler, *Das Marburger Religionsgespräch*.

3) *Die Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte*, IV, 414f.

4) Kidd, *Documents*, p. 247.

a Lutheran; perhaps he was Friederich Myconius, Lutheran pastor at Gotha, who was present at the Colloquy. Koehler, the Weimar Edition, and Schirrmacher carry his account.⁵⁾

In the Stadtbibliothek of Nuernberg reposes the original account of Osiander, the Lutheran. He came to Marburg sometime after the Colloquy began. Therefore the forepart of his account has hearsay as its basis. The rest of his account was written on the basis of recollection or perhaps notes. A transcript is reprinted in Koehler and in the Weimar Edition.

Bullinger, Zwingli's successor at Zurich, in his *History of the Reformation* has an account of the debate. It is evident that Bullinger used Collin as his source. Koehler also has this account.

Brenz, the precocious student of Luther, wrote three reports of the debate. Koehler has all the accounts. Pressel has two of the three.⁶⁾ The importance of the Brenz accounts lies in their emphasis on Zwingli's citations from the Church Fathers.

There is also the *Rhapsodie colloquii ad Marburgum*. The author is unknown. Luther is largely ignored throughout the account. In spite of its paucity of details, the account cannot be discarded. A copy is found in Koehler.

Koehler also lists the account of Heinrich Utinger. It is evident that this work does not have notes taken during the Colloquy as its basis.

Letters pertaining to the debate are found in almost every edition of Luther's works, particularly the St. Louis Edition.⁷⁾ The articles of faith, framed at the close of the debate and signed by the participants, are found in the Weimar and St. Louis editions.

Secondary accounts of the debate itself are poor. The standard biographies of Luther and Zwingli briefly discuss the Colloquy. German scholars have done some work in this field. At the present time there is no English monograph on the Marburg Colloquy available.

Marburg, October 1, 1529

After the Zwinglians and the Lutherans arrived at Marburg, Zwingli with Melanchthon, and Luther with Oecolampadius held private discussions before the general colloquy began.

Zwingli and Melanchthon have written detailed accounts of their preliminary discussion.⁸⁾ On the basis of the notes which Zwingli took during the preliminary discussion, the letter which

5) F. W. Schirrmacher, *Briefe und Acten zu der Geschichte des Religionsgespraches zu Marburg, 1529*.

6) Pressel, *Anecdota Brentiana*, p. 63ff.

7) Dr. Martin Luther's *Saemmtliche Schriften*, St. Louis, 1901, Band XVII.

8) Koehler, *Das Marburger Religionsgesprach*, pp. 40-48.

he wrote to Vadian shortly after the Marburg Colloquy, and the two letters which Melanchthon wrote to the Elector and to the Duke of Saxony, we can fairly accurately reconstruct their private debate, especially since Zwingli rewrote his notes in the form of a dialog. Bullinger has a lengthy account of this preliminary conference in his *History of the Reformation*, but he merely restates that which Zwingli has in his account.⁹⁾

Zwingli states that he and Melanchthon discussed the doctrine of Original Sin, the part the Word and Sacrament play in the operation of the Holy Spirit, and the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Melanchthon also states that these three doctrines were discussed, but he adds a fourth — the Deity of Jesus Christ. Bullinger also lists this doctrine as having been discussed. Zwingli probably failed to list it because he felt it to be a matter of course that Christian theologians should agree on that cardinal doctrine. Both disputants state that they agreed on all doctrines save that of the Lord's Supper. Melanchthon in his accounts simply states that the doctrine was discussed and takes for granted that unanimity was not reached. Zwingli's account is more detailed. In arguing with Melanchthon he used the same proofs which he had been wont to use in his previous polemical writings — John 6:63 and the local presence of Christ at the right hand of the Father. According to Zwingli, Melanchthon's repeated retort to these "proofs" was Matt. 26:26 — "This is My body." Zwingli finally accused the Wittenberg theologian of begging the question.

While Melanchthon and Zwingli were disputing, Luther and Oecolampadius were also carrying on a private discussion. Though letters were written in October of 1529 by Zwingli, Luther, Melanchthon, and though Bucer mentions this private debate, no account mentions the subject discussed.¹⁰⁾

The Participants

Osiander, Brenz, and Bullinger state that a number of people were excluded from the colloquy. None, save Osiander, gives a motive for the exclusion. Osiander attributes the exclusion to the sweating plague which was rampant at that time. But he is not sure; he merely offers that as a probable reason. Evidently the disputants felt that nothing could be gained by permitting the attendance of a large number of onlookers.

Brenz, Bucer, and Jonas agree on the composition of the group finally admitted. It consisted of Philip of Hesse, his chancellors, some lesser nobles and learned men. Brenz states that there were fifty or sixty people present. Zwingli in his letter to Vadian says

9) *Ibid.*, pp. 43, 44.

10) *Ibid.*, p. 48.

there were at the most twenty-four. Brenz undoubtedly more closely approximates the truth, since Jonas lists by name nineteen individuals who were present. And he admits that he is listing only prominent personages.¹¹⁾

The Colloquy

Philip's chancellor, Feige, formally opened the colloquy in the name of the prince. He stated the purpose of the meeting and thanked the participants for coming to Marburg. Hedio, the Swiss, and Osiander, the Lutheran, add that Feige instructed the disputants not to seek their own glory, but rather the glory of God. Osiander speaks from hearsay, since he did not arrive at Marburg until some time after Feige delivered his opening remarks. In all probability Feige so warned the theologians. That expression was a commonplace in theological discussion of that day.¹²⁾

While all accounts agree in stating that Luther made a few introductory remarks after Feige's speech, only two, Hedio and Anonymous, approximate completeness. Hedio says that Luther demanded that the doctrines of the Trinity, the Person of Christ, Baptism, Original Sin, and Purgatory be discussed first. He claimed that the Swiss had been in error on these points. Anonymous, whom on the basis of internal evidence we would judge to be Lutheran, lists in addition to the above-mentioned doctrines the doctrine of the Function of the Word of God and the doctrine of Justification.¹³⁾

According to Anonymous, Hedio, and Brenz, Zwingli answered Luther by saying that these doctrines had been discussed by himself and Melancthon and an agreeable settlement had been reached. Furthermore, Zwingli stated he had come to Marburg for the purpose of discussing the Lord's Supper. Hedio and Anonymous state that Oecolampadius concurred with Zwingli in these sentiments.¹⁴⁾

Then, according to all accounts save the so-called *Rhapsodie colloquii ad Marburgum*, Luther contended that the fundamental thesis of the colloquy must be the words of Christ "This is My body." As the writer of the *Rhapsodie* consistently excludes Luther from his account, his omission does not militate against the authenticity of the contention.¹⁵⁾

At this juncture, according to one eyewitness, Collin, Luther wrote the words *hoc est corpus meum* on the table before him. Osiander, who was not present at the time, supports Collin. It is

11) *Ibid.*, pp. 49—51.

12) *Ibid.*, p. 52.

13) *Ibid.*, pp. 53, 54.

14) *Ibid.*, pp. 54, 55.

15) *Ibid.*, pp. 55—57.

strange that this more or less dramatic episode in the debate is not noted by more than one eyewitness.¹⁶⁾

For the next few hours the colloquy assumed the form of a debate between Luther and Oecolampadius.

According to Hedio, Collin, Anonymous, and Bullinger (whom we can exclude from consideration since he merely copies Collin) Oecolampadius endeavored to show Luther that the words "This is My body" could be understood figuratively. Collin and Anonymous state that Oecolampadius, in proof of this thesis, cited John 15:1, where Christ's words "I am the true Vine" are recorded. Hedio does not list this passage, but it is evident from Luther's answer that the passage was cited.¹⁷⁾ Luther in his answer was willing to admit that the Bible uses figures of speech, but he was unwilling to admit that John 15:1 and the words of institution were such figures. He appealed to the Church Fathers for support. Hedio and Collin, the Swiss representatives, are alone in recording this reply of Luther. Later, however, Anonymous, in summarizing this phase of the debate, puts essentially the same words into Luther's mouth which Collin and Hedio do.¹⁸⁾

According to Hedio and Collin, Oecolampadius reiterated that "I am the true Vine" could be interpreted figuratively.¹⁹⁾ That this statement is authentic is shown by Luther's answer, which is chronicled by three eyewitnesses. In his answer Luther maintained that before any passage of Scripture could be interpreted figuratively, it must be proved that such an interpretation is the only possible one.²⁰⁾

Then Hedio, Collin, and Anonymous state that Oecolampadius tried a new approach in order to prove that "This is My body" could be interpreted figuratively. He read passages from the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel in which Christ speaks of a spiritual eating. In this chapter is found the *locus classicus* of the Swiss: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing."²¹⁾ By this passage, according to Hedio and Collin, Oecolampadius contended that Christ for all time rejected a carnal eating of His body.²²⁾ The authenticity of the citation of John 6 is substantiated by the immediate context, which shows that the subsequent discussion between Luther and his Swiss opponent revolved around the interpretation of John 6 and the difference between an oral and a spiritual eating and drinking.

Hedio, Collin, and Anonymous chronicle Luther as remaining with John 6 and interpreting it in such a manner as not to violate

16) *Ibid.*, p. 57.

19) *Ibid.*

17) *Ibid.*, p. 58.

20) *Ibid.*

18) *Ibid.*, p. 59.

21) John 6:63.

22) Koehler, *Das Marburger Religionsgespräch*, pp. 59, 60.

his doctrine of the Real Presence. Luther maintained that in John 6 the Lord is speaking of the Jews of Capernaum and is trying to impress upon their all too carnal minds the fact that His body was not to be eaten as meat on a plate but in a more spiritual manner.²³⁾

Then Oecolampadius, according to Collin and Anonymous, claimed Luther had admitted in his previous writings that the Scriptures could be interpreted in a dual fashion.²⁴⁾ The other eyewitnesses do not have this charge of Oecolampadius. Probably they well knew that Luther never denied the dual interpretation. Anonymous makes much of Oecolampadius' charge. It seems that he sets up a straw man for Luther to demolish.

Anonymous (whom we believe to be Lutheran) alone lists Luther's answer, in which the German Reformer stated that the elements in the sacraments — bread, wine, and water — are indeed ordinary things, but that when they are associated with God's word, they assume a higher, a nobler aspect.²⁵⁾ It is a passage such as this one which makes it evident that Anonymous is a Lutheran; for nowhere do the other chroniclers ever state Luther's tenets as clearly and as completely as Anonymous does in this passage and in others. In this particular case the Reformed eyewitnesses ignore Luther's answer.

While Collin and Hedio do not list Luther's answer, they do carry Oecolampadius' rebuttal to Luther's statement, which Anonymous alone has. Oecolampadius told Luther that Christ's presence in the bread and wine was not a matter of faith but rather a matter of opinion, and that it was dangerous to attribute too much to the elements.²⁶⁾ According to Hedio he cited a passage from Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana* ²⁷⁾ in substantiation of his thesis. The authenticity of the citation from Augustine is shown by Luther's answer.

Hedio, Collin, and the *Rhapsodie* list Luther's answer, in which he again pointed out that common things become worthy of awe and reverence because of their association with God's Word. Augustine's opinion made little impression upon Luther. According to the *Rhapsodie* he stated that if Augustine taught that bread and wine were mere symbols, he had better walk in Christ's footsteps and teach as He taught.²⁸⁾ This is a statement which is characteristically "Lutheran."

The next interchange of arguments is chronicled by Hedio alone. The other writers probably felt that the discussion was merely

23) *Ibid.*, pp. 60, 61.

26) *Ibid.*, p. 62.

24) *Ibid.*, p. 61.

27) Lib. III, chapter 9.

25) *Ibid.*, p. 61.

28) Koehler, *Das Marburger Religionsgespräch*, pp. 62, 63.

a restatement of what had been said previously, and therefore failed to list it. Oecolampadius accused Luther of teaching that the word of God brings the body of Christ into the elements. Luther admitted that to be his view.²⁹⁾

Then, according to Collin, Anonymous, and the *Rhapsodie*, Oecolampadius asked whether a spiritual eating did not exclude a bodily eating.³⁰⁾ Hedio does not have the question, but he does list Luther's answer.

Luther evidently saw that Oecolampadius implied a denial of a spiritual eating and drinking on Luther's part, for the Wittenberger emphatically protested, saying that he did not deny a spiritual reception. However, he maintained that a bodily eating and drinking is also taught, as evidenced by the words "Eat, this is My body." According to Collin, Luther asserted that he would and could eat manure for his spiritual edification if God so commanded.³¹⁾ This outburst must not be disregarded because a single eyewitness records it, and he a Swiss; for we know that Luther was capable of statements even more earthy in content. This spirited reply of Luther, exclusive of the manure item, is chronicled by Hedio, Collin, Anonymous, and the *Rhapsodie*.

Luther and Zwingli

Luther and Oecolampadius closed their argument by a restatement of their *loci classici*, Matt. 26:26 and John 6:63, respectively.³²⁾

Oecolampadius then retired for a time from active participation in the colloquy, and Zwingli took his place.

Zwingli began by accusing Luther of being motivated by a preconceived bias. Comparing Luther with the heresiarch Helvidius,³³⁾ the Zurich theologian asserted that Luther was unwilling to withdraw from an erroneous position even after his error had been made evident. Hedio, Collin, and Bullinger list this comparison. Bullinger was not present; he uses his co-religionists as his source. The inept character of the comparison is undoubtedly a factor in the Lutheran failure to list it.

Two Lutherans, Brenz and Osiander, briefly summarize Zwingli's lengthy speech. Hedio and Collin are more detailed. Zwingli's opening argument can be divided into three parts. In the

29) *Ibid.*, p. 63.

31) *Ibid.*, pp. 64, 65.

30) *Ibid.*, p. 64.

32) *Ibid.*, pp. 65, 66.

33) Helvidius was a heresiarch of the fourth century, a layman who opposed the growing superstitions of the Church, especially the worship of Mary. He maintained that Mary had other children besides Jesus. The Greek sometimes uses the same word for brother and for cousin. Therefore, when the New Testament speaks of the brothers of Jesus, some commentators translate it as cousins. (McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*.)

first place, he reiterated John 6:63, quoting the original Greek, and emphasized that the words "The flesh profiteth nothing" exclude a bodily eating. In the second place, he chided Luther for his emphasis on a literal interpretation, claiming that it was childish of Luther to say that he would eat manure if the Lord so commanded. Finally, he excused himself for speaking harshly and pleaded for union. He claimed that agreement in all points of doctrine was not essential for unity.³⁴⁾

Collin, Hedio, and Anonymous agree essentially in regard to Luther's answer. According to Collin and Hedio, Luther first disposed of the Helvidius reference by pointing out that when the New Testament uses the word brother, it often means cousin.³⁵⁾

The Zwinglians had previously argued that God never presents man with anything incomprehensible; Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is incomprehensible; therefore it could not be of God. Luther cited the doctrine of the Forgiveness of Sins and the doctrine of the Virgin Birth, both of which voided the major premise in this syllogism.³⁶⁾

The German Reformer then assumed a more positive attitude and stated the place of faith in his doctrine of the Supper. He asserted that while the mouth received the body of Christ, the soul accepted by faith the words of Christ. Anonymous agrees with Collin and Hedio here, but he brings in a new idea. He quotes Luther as saying that an unbeliever, one without faith, in receiving the Lord's Supper, also eats the Lord's body and drinks his blood—but to his damnation. While Luther taught that an unbeliever ate and drank the Lord's body and blood to his damnation, there is no reason to believe that he stated that view here. Anonymous in his Lutheran zeal is evidently moved by a desire for completeness in stating what happens when both believers and unbelievers partake of the Lord's Supper.³⁷⁾

Hedio, Collin, and Anonymous record Zwingli as having cited Ezek. 5:5—a passage in which a symbolical act on the part of the Prophet Ezekiel represents Jerusalem—to prove that the symbolical meaning is often found in Scripture. The three Reformed writers Hedio, Collin, and the author of the *Rhapsodie* further record Zwingli as having accused Luther of investing the word of God with magical qualities when he claimed that a recitation of the words of institution over the elements brought the body and blood therein.³⁸⁾ Bullinger and Osiander do not list Zwingli's charges. However, their accounts are *résumés*. Brenz also fails to

34) Koehler, *Das Marburger Religionsgespräch*, pp. 66—69.

35) *Ibid.*, pp. 69, 70.

37) *Ibid.*

36) *Ibid.*

38) *Ibid.*, pp. 71—73.

record; probably because no essentially new arguments were offered by the Zurich theologian.

According to all the commentators except Brenz and Osiander, Luther differentiated between an allegorical and a literal interpretation of the Bible. He claimed that most of the Old Testament passages which the Zwinglians had cited to prove that Scripture, particularly the words of institution, could be interpreted figuratively were allegorical passages. The three Reformed writers Collin, Hedio, and the author of the *Rhapsodie* have Luther close his statement with the argument that the Zwinglian key passage: "So, then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, He was received up into heaven, and sat at the right hand of God"³⁹⁾ could as well be interpreted figuratively or symbolically as the words of institution could.⁴⁰⁾

Only the Swiss writers Hedio, Collin, and Bullinger list Zwingli's reply. According to Hedio, Zwingli asked Luther not to commit the logical error of *petitio principii* by asking for a symbolical interpretation of Mark 16:19. All the writers assert that Zwingli cited John 6:63 and averred that he would not retreat from that stronghold. Bullinger merely translates the Latin of Collin into old German. He piously adds, however, that John 6:63 is the only passage which can give man a correct conception of the true eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood. Again, the other chroniclers drop Zwingli's answer, the cause probably being that his argument was an oft-repeated one.⁴¹⁾

Luther retorted by saying that Zwingli's tone was becoming bitter. There is no conclusive evidence that this remark was uttered. Only Collin and Hedio list it, and they collaborated.⁴²⁾

Zwingli again referred to John 6. This and the following remarks of Zwingli are chronicled by Hedio, Collin, and, of course, Bullinger.⁴³⁾ The other writers ignore them, either because they were lost to them in the quick interchange of remarks or because of their inconsequential character.

Luther answered by maintaining that John 6 was not pertinent to a discussion of the Lord's Supper.⁴⁴⁾ Incidentally, this is the argument which Lutheran theologians use today in discussing the Lord's Supper with Reformed churchmen, namely, that the Savior is not speaking of the Eucharist in John 6:63. Modern Lutherans have often wondered why Luther failed to stress this point to a greater degree at Marburg.

39) Mark 16:19.

40) Koehler, *Das Marburger Religionsgespräch*, pp. 73—75.

41) *Ibid.*, p. 75.

43) *Ibid.*, pp. 75, 76.

42) *Ibid.*, p. 75.

44) *Ibid.*, p. 76.

According to Hedio, Zwingli told Luther it remained for him to prove his previous assertion in regard to John 6.⁴⁵⁾ Luther then accused Zwingli of resorting to sophistical dialectic. Again only Hedio lists this charge.⁴⁶⁾ Zwingli's answer proves its textual authenticity, for Collin, Hedio, and Bullinger record Zwingli as having observed that it was not the "sophistical dialectic" which irked the Wittenberger, but rather the fact that John 6 was a "neck breaker" for him.⁴⁷⁾

All the writers save Brenz and the author of the *Rhapsodie* list Luther's answer. Osiander, who was present by this time, gives more personal and intimate details in his narrative account. He points out that after the last comparatively bitter interchange of remarks, Luther in a friendly fashion urged Zwingli to keep rancor out of the debate and to refrain from "tedious, unnecessary, irrelevant, and disgusting drivel" (*lanng, unnoetig, undienstlich, und verdriesslich geschwetz*).⁴⁸⁾

The burden of Luther's answer, however, concerns itself with Zwingli's oft-repeated charge that according to Luther's interpretation the ungodly, or unworthy, eat the Lord's body and drink His blood. Luther admitted the truthfulness of the charge, but he added that in so doing they eat and drink to their damnation.⁴⁹⁾

It must have been apparent to Zwingli that the noon hour was near. He answered Luther's last speech with an apology for his bitterness in debate by saying that such bitterness was a characteristic of the Swiss. Only Collin and Bullinger, the secondary source, record this remark.⁵⁰⁾

At this point Landgrave Philip of Hesse accepted Zwingli's apology and at the same time urged Luther to be more calm. The disputants then stopped for the noon meal.⁵¹⁾

At the beginning of the afternoon session Zwingli opened the debate by quoting a section from Luther's Septuagesima sermon in which he spoke of a spiritual eating and drinking in — what seemed to Zwingli — a rather carnal manner. In opposition to Luther's view Zwingli then quoted a section from Melancthon's exegesis of St. John's Gospel in which Luther's co-worker had stated that Christ was not eaten in a fleshly manner by the faithful and that the words of institution were to be interpreted symbolically. He insisted that the two Lutherans contradicted each other.⁵²⁾ This speech of Zwingli is found in all the accounts save those of Osiander and Brenz. Perhaps these two Lutheran chroniclers were reluctant to record this discrepancy in the views of their leaders.

45) *Ibid.*

46) *Ibid.*

47) *Ibid.*

48) *Ibid.*, p. 77.

49) *Ibid.*, pp. 76—78.

50) *Ibid.*, p. 78.

51) *Ibid.*, pp. 78, 79.

52) *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 80.

Luther dismissed the apparent or real contradiction between his and Melancthon's statements with few words and returned again to his prime proof text: "*Hoc est corpus meum.*" He again stated that whenever bread and wine were offered according to the institution of Christ, there also, because of Christ's promise, would be His body and blood. He also repeated that doctrine which was particularly offensive to the Zwinglians, namely, that even when an unbeliever acts as the officiant in the Sacrament of the Altar, the body and blood are still present. He stoutly maintained that the validity of the Sacrament was not dependent upon the righteousness or faith of the officiant, as the Donatists⁵³⁾ and Anabaptists⁵⁴⁾ had maintained. Again, only Brenz and Osiander omit this section.⁵⁵⁾

Zwingli countered by branding the idea an absurdity and an impious thought that unbelievers could cause the body and blood to be present in the Sacrament. No account of any importance omits this retort.⁵⁶⁾

53) Donatism originated in Carthage, North Africa, shortly after the Diocletian persecution. The Donatists took issue with the Catholic Church in matters of church discipline and martyrdom. The schismatic party held that the *traditores*, or those who had surrendered copies of Scripture during the recent persecution, had committed a mortal sin. In 311 Caecilian was hastily elected and consecrated Bishop of Carthage. The consecration service was performed by Felix of Aptunga, whom the Donatists declared to be a *traditor*. This offense, they declared, rendered all the official acts of Felix invalid, including the ordination of Caecilian. A group of 70 bishops assembled at Carthage and elected Majorinus as rival bishop in 312. He died the following year and was succeeded by Donatus the Great, from whom the schismatic party took its name. For many years there were two warring factions in the North African Church. After Augustine had been elected Bishop of Hippo in 395, he tried to effect a reconciliation between the factions. He entered the controversy on the Catholic side and declared that the character of a minister does not affect his official acts, though the official may be an unworthy man. Augustine's opposition gave Donatism its deathblow. The Donatists disappeared in the turmoil surrounding the Vandal invasion of North Africa. (McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*.)

54) Anabaptism was a collective name for a wide variety of religious opinions held by various groups. All groups held at least three things in common: they rejected infant baptism and rebaptized members who had been baptized as children (Anabaptists means Rebaptizers); they avoided state or national churches because these, they claimed, numbered many nominal Christians, while a true church should be an association of believers only; they subordinated the outward Word of God and the Sacraments to the subjective experience of the "inner light" of the Spirit. There were two types of Anabaptists, the quietists and the revolutionaries. The quietists believed in passive resistance to temporal authority when it conflicted with their beliefs. The revolutionaries were fanatics who advocated the overthrow of the authority of Church and State. (McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*.)

55) Koehler, *Das Marburger Religionsgespräch*, pp. 80—83.

56) *Ibid.*, p. 83.

Luther retaliated by citing both Scripture and the Church Fathers in order to prove that the faith or lack of faith of an officiating clergyman in no way affects the validity or efficacy of a Sacrament. *E. g.*: Paul's statement regarding the baptism of Gaius and Crispus in 1 Cor. 1:14-16; the Savior's words regarding the Pharisees in Matt. 23; the discipleship of Judas, the betrayer; and Augustine's polemic against the Donatists. He closed by saying that God's words were efficacious (*wirkungskraeftig*) at all times, regardless of the speaker of the words. Only Brenz and Osiander, together with Bullinger, whose account is secondary, omit this part of the debate.⁵⁷⁾

In his answer, which Hedio, Collin, and the anonymous Lutheran have, Zwingli distinguishes between the act, or office, or administering a Sacrament and the act, or office, of preaching. He classified Luther's "*Hoc est corpus meum*" text under the office of preaching.⁵⁸⁾ What he implied by that remark becomes clear by noting Luther's answer, in which he was unwilling to admit any subtle distinction between the act of preaching and the act of administering the Sacraments.⁵⁹⁾

Zwingli was willing to agree that the efficacy of God's Word was not dependent upon the righteousness or unrighteousness of the preacher or speaker. However, he was unwilling to admit that the Sacrament of the Altar or the Sacrament of Holy Baptism became efficacious wherever and to whomever it might be administered in spite of the faith or lack of faith of the officiating clergyman; hence the attempted distinction between the two offices.

Next follows an interchange of remarks between Zwingli and Luther which is chronicled only by Anonymous.

In this section the two disputants repeated, to a greater or lesser degree, what had been said before.

Zwingli attempted to identify Luther's contention that the efficacy of the Sacraments was not dependent upon the faith of the officiating clergyman with the view held by the Church of Rome. Luther answered by saying that since no one could be sure of the faith of the officiant, the efficacy of a Sacrament must rest with God's word. Concerning that there could be no doubt, he held.

Then Zwingli turned from the faith of the officiant to the faith of the recipient. He argued that if the word of God was the criterion for judging the validity of the Sacrament of the Altar, then even the unbelieving recipients would of necessity receive not only the body and the blood but also the benefits of the Lord's Supper when it was administered according to Christ's institution.

57) *Ibid.*, pp. 83, 84.

59) *Ibid.*

58) *Ibid.*, p. 84.

Luther agreed that the unbelieving recipients of the elements and the body and blood were affected by their eating and drinking. However, they were affected in a manner wholly different from that in which the believers were affected. The unbelievers, instead of receiving the assurance of the forgiveness of sins and the strengthening of faith, eat and drink to their damnation.⁶⁰⁾ He evidently based his remarks on that portion of the Letter to the Corinthians where Paul in his discussion of the Lord's Supper said: "For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body."⁶¹⁾

On the basis of both external and internal evidence we are forced to reject this last interchange of remarks as an integral part of the debate. In the first place, only Anonymous records the remarks. The Hedio and Collin accounts, the most complete of all, are silent on this point. It might be argued that since they were Reformed, they intentionally dropped these decisive remarks of Luther. However, no other Lutheran eyewitness lists them. The remarks themselves do not appear authentic. They contain an argument which Luther hitherto in his writings and in the debate had not used and which was frequently used later. We refer to his reasoning regarding the Christian's lack of certainty concerning the efficacy of the Lord's Supper when such efficacy was dependent on the faith of the officiating clergyman. Perhaps Anonymous, composing his account some time after the Marburg Colloquy, felt that this argument had been used or should have been used.

Oecolampadius — Luther — Melanchthon

Afternoon of October 2, 1529

At this juncture in the Colloquy, Zwingli, for reasons not given, turned the defense of the Reformed tenets over to Oecolampadius. Luther and Melanchthon (briefly) continued the defense of the German position.

Oecolampadius opened the second phase of the debate by expressing dissatisfaction with Luther's exposition of John 6. In fact, he accused Luther of violating Scripture. He cited Christ's conversation with Nicodemus in John 3. In that chapter Christ demands rebirth, or regeneration, as the prerequisite for entrance into the kingdom of God. That prerequisite, Oecolampadius asserted, makes actual reception of Christ's body in the Sacrament of the Altar unnecessary and useless. Only Brenz and Osiander fail to list the statement. Their accounts make no claim to completeness.⁶²⁾

60) *Ibid.*, pp. 85, 86.

61) 1 Cor. 11:29.

62) Koehler, *Das Marburger Religionsgespräch*, pp. 86, 87.

According to two Zwinglian eyewitnesses and one Lutheran, the Wittenberger responded by heartily agreeing with Oecolampadius regarding the inviolability of Scripture. But he was unwilling to agree that John 3 rendered his view of the bodily reception untenable. On the contrary, he maintained that God had set up three means, or methods — the Word, the Sacrament of Baptism, and the actual reception of the Lord's body and blood — for the purpose of working and effecting saving faith, rebirth, or regeneration. Therefore, instead of being "useless and unnecessary," the reception of the body of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar strengthened the faith of the reborn, or regenerated, man.⁶³⁾

The fact that four accounts do not list this statement of Luther does not militate against its authenticity. Two Reformed writers and one Lutheran are agreed in their presentation. Moreover, the statement is a distinctly Lutheran view. Repeatedly, before and after the Marburg Colloquy, Luther expressed these sentiments in regard to the means of grace.

One chronicler, Anonymous, lists an interchange of remarks between Luther and Oecolampadius which is undoubtedly authentic. According to Anonymous, Oecolampadius cited John 16:28, a passage in which Christ said that he was leaving the world to return to the Father. Luther retaliated with Luke 24:44, a passage which he claimed correctly interpreted Oecolampadius' citation.⁶⁴⁾

We are forced to admit these remarks into the colloquy despite the fact that only one writer lists them. The unity of the immediate and remote context demands that the passage be accepted as genuine.

Oecolampadius continued by chiding Luther for placing too much emphasis on the words "This is My body." He added that there were passages which stated that Christ was living and reigning in heaven.⁶⁵⁾ Only Hedio and Collin list this remark. However, other writers show by Luther's immediate answer that the remark was made.

Luther's answer is lacking only in the Brenz and Osiander accounts; they are both skeletal accounts. In his answer Luther admitted that he emphasized the passage "This is My body"; but he maintained that such emphasis did not preclude his believing that Christ was also sitting at the right hand of the Father. That his view was irrational and contrary to the laws of nature did not bother him. His faith was great enough to believe both statements.⁶⁶⁾

In rebuttal Oecolampadius listed one of the properties of

63) *Ibid.*, pp. 87, 88.

64) *Ibid.*, p. 88.

65) *Ibid.*, p. 89.

66) *Ibid.*, pp. 89, 90.

matter—a body can be in only one place at any given time.⁶⁷⁾ Only two men, both Lutherans, Brenz and Anonymous, list this rejoinder. Again the reply of Luther and the subsequent remarks attest to its authenticity.

Luther called Oecolampadius' last remark "mathematical hair-splitting" and would have none of it. He maintained that that which was physically impossible with man was possible with God.⁶⁸⁾ Two Lutherans and one Zwinglian, the writer of the *Rhapsodie*, admit the answer of Luther. Perhaps Collin and Hedio felt that Luther's remarks were of too little importance or that Luther's trust on faith in God's Word and power had been stated often enough.

When he continued, Oecolampadius qualified his previous statement regarding Christ's departure from this world and his session at the right hand of the Father. He explained that while Christ as a member of the Trinity, or Godhead, was all-pervasive, He nevertheless, according to His human nature, had departed from this world and therefore could not be bodily present in the elements of the Lord's Supper. Oecolampadius admitted that Christ was present in the elements, but only in the same manner in which He is all-pervasive, not bodily (*leiblich*).⁶⁹⁾ Only Brenz and Osiander omit this phase of the argument. The reasons for their omission have been listed above.

Luther refused to agree to this peculiar division of the two natures of Christ. He held that the words of institution required the type of faith which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews extols in his eleventh chapter, a faith in things not seen.⁷⁰⁾ Again Brenz, Osiander, and Bullinger fail to list the answer of Luther. Bullinger has Collin as his source; therefore his omission is inconsequential.

Oecolampadius then warned Luther not to emphasize the humanity of Christ to the exclusion of His deity.⁷¹⁾ Luther curtly answered that he knew only of a God who became man. He would have no other.⁷²⁾

Only one Zwinglian and one Lutheran, both eyewitnesses, have this interchange of remarks. Nevertheless we are compelled to accept these remarks because of external and internal evidence. One writer is a Zwinglian, the other a Lutheran. The type of language and expression used by both men shows that they are expressing the same idea independently.

Oecolampadius countered with a new approach. He cited 2 Cor. 5:16, a passage in which St. Paul states that we cannot know

67) *Ibid.*, p. 90.

68) *Ibid.*, pp. 90, 91.

69) *Ibid.*

70) *Ibid.*, pp. 92, 93.

71) *Ibid.*, p. 93.

72) *Ibid.*

Christ according to the flesh.⁷³⁾ All except the *Rhapsodie* and Bullinger have this citation.

According to Hedio and Collin, Melanchthon entered the debate at this point for the purpose of correcting the faulty exegesis of Oecolampadius in the case of 2 Cor. 5:16. The two Reformed writers claim that Melanchthon pointed out that the passage in question teaches that we cannot know Christ according to *our* flesh, not *His* flesh.⁷⁴⁾ However, Brenz and Anonymous assert that Luther made the correction in exegesis.⁷⁵⁾ We are inclined to agree with Collin and Hedio. Their accounts were written on the basis of notes. Moreover, a careless observer would naturally assume that Luther would make the correction since he was leading this section of the debate.

Ignoring the correction, Oecolampadius tried another approach. That Christ had a mortal body was his major premise; his minor premise — that mortal body was sacrificed on the cross of Calvary. He concluded that the mortal body became valueless at Christ's death.⁷⁶⁾ Two writers, one Lutheran and the other Zwinglian, have this syllogism, together with Luther's answer. The German claimed that the question of the mortality of Christ's body was irrelevant; the promises of God caused the body to be present in the Holy Eucharist.⁷⁷⁾

Zwingli and Luther

Afternoon of October 2, 1529

Apparently, noting that his colleague was not faring too well in his encounter with the Wittenberger, Zwingli again took the field.

He returned to the physical impossibility of Christ's body occupying two places at the same time. He cited Rom. 8:3; Phil. 2:6 ff.; Heb. 2:17; 4:15; 1 Cor. 15:48 to prove that Christ had a mortal body. He added that all men have mortal bodies, which cannot occupy two places at the same time. Therefore Christ's body is incapable of being in heaven at the right hand of the Father and in the bread and wine simultaneously. He concluded by adding that Augustine and Fulgentius⁷⁸⁾ supported his conclusion.⁷⁹⁾ No eyewitness fails to list these remarks in one form or another.

73) *Ibid.*, p. 94.

76) *Ibid.*, p. 95.

74) *Ibid.*

77) *Ibid.*

75) *Ibid.*, pp. 94, 95.

78) Ferrandus Fulgentius was a deacon in Carthage. He died in 551 A.D. He was active in the controversy at that time agitating the Church whether it was orthodox to say, "One person of the Trinity has suffered." He defended this expression, but recommended to add "in the flesh which he assumed." His writings are numerous, the most outstanding being his polemic against the Arians and other heretics. (McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*.)

79) Koehler, *Das Marburger Religionsgespräch*, pp. 97—99.

Luther dismissed the citations from Augustine and Fulgentius by saying that both parties in the debate could find supporters for their views among the Church Fathers. He partially admitted the validity of the Scripture passages which Zwingli adduced. He was willing to admit that Christ had a mortal body similar to ours. However, he maintained that since Jesus was God, His body was invested with a power which transcended any "mathematical propositions," namely, the power of ubiquity.⁸⁰⁾ Again, no eyewitness omits this passage.

At this point the debate was closed for the day. On the following morning, Sunday, October 3, argumentation was resumed, Zwingli and Luther holding the floor.

Zwingli began by again citing Phil. 2:6: "Who [Christ], being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." It was Zwingli's contention that if Christ had form (*morphe*), he must of necessity occupy space and therefore could not be ubiquitous.⁸¹⁾ Anonymous, Hedio, Collin, and Bullinger are agreed on the substance of Zwingli's remarks. Only Osiander, Brenz, and the *Rhapsodie* (all short accounts) are silent on this point.

In answering, Luther reiterated his previous argument that God's power is not limited by physical laws. He asserted that God could make a body ubiquitous if he would.⁸²⁾ Brenz, who is silent on the rest of the debate, and the author of *Rhapsodie*, who generally ignores Luther, do not list Luther's reply.

Zwingli accused Luther of missing the mark, of arguing the possible rather than the actual. No one, he said, had laid any limitations on the power of God.⁸³⁾ Again, the *Rhapsodie*, Brenz, and the incomplete account of Osiander are silent.

Luther then again quoted his classic proof text: "This is My body."⁸⁴⁾ The passage is well authenticated, since the *Rhapsodie* is the only writer of consequence who drops it.

In answer to Luther's literal interpretation of the words of institution Zwingli again cited Fulgentius and Augustine in order to prove that the Swiss theologians were not the originators of the doctrine that Christ's body is locally confined in heaven.⁸⁵⁾ No consequential chronicle omits Zwingli's speech.

It is in this section that one account, in reporting the debate, unconsciously strikes a humorous note. In reporting Zwingli's apparently lengthy citation from the Fathers, Osiander says: "Welliches gar lanckweylig zu hoeren war."⁸⁶⁾

Luther was unwilling to admit the validity of the citation from

80) *Ibid.*, pp. 99—101.

81) *Ibid.*, p. 107.

82) *Ibid.*, pp. 107—109.

83) *Ibid.*, p. 109.

84) *Ibid.*, pp. 109, 110.

85) *Ibid.*, pp. 111, 112.

86) *Ibid.*, p. 112.

Fulgentius. He argued that Fulgentius, in the passage to which Zwingli alluded, was discussing the two natures in Christ and not the Lord's Supper.⁸⁷⁾ All accounts have the speech of Luther regarding Fulgentius, except that of Brenz and Osiander. But even they do not omit it entirely. Brenz speaks of a discussion concerning "*veteres patres*."⁸⁸⁾

While their accounts vary, all the eyewitnesses are agreed that Zwingli and Luther spent the rest of the morning in a more or less heated debate regarding the local and illocal presence of Christ's body. Zwingli approached the point in question with reason as his standard of judgment. As a result he argued that since Christ had ascended into heaven, He could not be in the bread and wine. Luther, using faith as his standard of judgment, was willing to believe that Jesus could be in both places, heaven and the elements of the Sacrament of the Altar.⁸⁹⁾

Sunday Afternoon, October 3

On Sunday afternoon, October 3, Luther and Oecolampadius continued the debate. Their remarks are noted by Hedio and Collin, who collaborated, and Bullinger, who copiously used Collin as his source.⁹⁰⁾ The paucity of chroniclers reporting this section is probably due to the fact that the other eyewitnesses considered the arguments discussed on Sunday afternoon a repetition of what had been previously stated. Oecolampadius restated Zwingli's doctrine of the local presence and cited Augustine and Fulgentius to substantiate his view.

According to Hedio, Brenz, and Osiander, the debate ended with a protest on the part of the mediating Strassburg theologians against Luther's statement at the beginning of the colloquy regarding their unorthodoxy.⁹¹⁾ Jacob Sturm began the defense of the Strassburgers. Later it was taken up by Bucer. Luther made light of his previous accusation by stating that the Strassburg theologians were not his disciples; therefore he was not much concerned with what they taught.

The debate was formally closed by Chancellor Feige.⁹²⁾

The Results

The immediate result of the Colloquy expressed itself in the form of a series of articles or theses of faith drawn up by Luther at the close of the debate.⁹³⁾ While the articles, as d'Aubigné somewhat enthusiastically states, stand as the "first bulwark erected

87) *Ibid.*, pp. 112, 113.

88) *Ibid.*, p. 112.

89) *Ibid.*, pp. 113—120.

93) *Cambridge Modern History*, II, 209.

90) *Ibid.*, pp. 120—127.

91) *Ibid.*, pp. 127—130; 53.

92) *Ibid.*, p. 131.

in common by the reformers against Rome,"⁹⁴⁾ they did not represent or effect a religious unity between the Lutherans and the Zwinglians. Each group went home from Marburg claiming the victory; and despite their mutual agreement to adopt a more irenic policy in their writings, the controversy continued.⁹⁵⁾

Since the attempt at religious unity — the prerequisite for political unity — failed, Philip of Hesse's plan for a Pan-Protestant union also failed. Shortly after the Marburg Colloquy, when the idea of a political union was again broached, the Lutherans asserted that they would rather make an agreement with the heathen than with those who interpreted the words of Christ's institution of the Last Supper symbolically.⁹⁶⁾ Evidently they felt that in the former case no denial of the truth would be involved, while in the latter their action might be interpreted as betokening an attitude of indifference toward a manifest error.

It is apparent, therefore, that the desired results of the Marburg Colloquy were not attained. The continued lack of unity among the Protestants of Europe stands as a monument to the failure of Philip of Hesse's ambitious plan. The Colloquy marked the lasting division between the Lutheran and the Reformed faiths. From a higher point of view we can say that the Colloquy was a success. The strong temptation confronting the Lutherans to effect a compromise — a course which Zwingli was quite willing to take — was overcome; they remained faithful to their convictions and demonstrated to the world that they considered loyalty to the Word of God more important than worldly prominence and power.

Appendix

The Marburg Articles

Philip of Hesse said, "We must let the Christian world know that, except the manner of the presence of the body and blood in the Eucharist, you are agreed in all the articles of faith."⁹⁷⁾ In compliance with the Landgrave's request fourteen articles dealing with the major tenets of the Christian faith were drawn up and signed by Luther and Zwingli together with their respective colleagues:

"First, we — both parties — unanimously believe and hold that there is one, true, and natural God, Creator of heaven and earth and of all creatures; and that this same God, one in essence and nature, is threefold in person; that is to say, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as was declared in the Nicene Council and as all the Christian Church professes.

94) D'Aubigné, *History of the Reformation*, p. 393.

95) Eells, *Martin Bucer*, p. 97.

96) Smith, *Age of the Reformation*, p. 110.

97) T. Engelder, *Theological Monthly*, IX, 101.

"Secondly, we believe that neither the Father nor the Holy Spirit, but the Son of God the Father, who is by nature God, became man through the working of the Holy Spirit and without the benefit of the seed of man was born of the Virgin Mary; that He had body and soul as other men have, but was without sin.

"Thirdly, we believe that this same Son of God and of Mary, Jesus Christ, undivided in person, was crucified for us, died, was buried, rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father, is Lord over all creatures, and will come for the purpose of judging the living and the dead.

"Fourthly, we believe that original sin is received and inherited by us from Adam and is capable of damning all men. And had not Christ helped us with His life and death, we would of a necessity have perished eternally and would not be permitted to enter God's kingdom of bliss.

"Fifthly, we believe that we were saved not only from the power of that (original) sin as well as from the power of all other sins, but also from eternal death by our faith in God's Son, Jesus Christ, who died for us. Beyond that faith good works and position avail nothing in freeing one from the power of sin.

"Sixthly, we believe that such faith is a gift of God which we cannot obtain by previous good works, service, or by our own strength; rather, the Holy Spirit—at will—gives to and creates in our hearts this faith, if we hear the Gospel or Christ's words.

"Seventhly, we believe that this faith is our righteousness before God, on account of which God declares us to be righteous, pious, and holy. It defends us from sin, death, and hell; it receives us into grace and makes us blessed. By this faith we are made partakers of the Son's righteousness, life, and gifts. Therefore ascetic living and holy vows, when they are reckoned as aids to salvation, are accursed.

"Eightly, we believe that the Holy Spirit never works or creates this faith in the heart of any man unless he first hears preaching, the spoken Word, or the Gospel of Christ. By those means the Holy Spirit creates faith in whom and when He will. Rom. 10:17.

"Ninthly, we believe that Holy Baptism is a Sacrament which has been instituted by God as an aid to such faith. And, because God's command—"Ite, baptisate," Matt. 28:19—and God's promise—"Qui crediderit," etc., Mark 16:16—are contained in Baptism, it is not an empty symbol or watchword among Christians; but it is a sign and work of God which creates faith and by which we are born again.

"Tenthly, we believe that this faith, which is created by the

Holy Spirit and by which we are declared righteous, moves us to do good works, namely, to love our neighbor, to pray to God, and to suffer all persecution.

"Eleventhly, we believe that confession or conference with one's pastor or neighbor should not be mandatory but voluntary. However, it is helpful to those who are brokenhearted, oppressed, cumbered by sin, or fallen into error. Of special importance is the comfort of absolution which they receive from the Gospel, which is the only correct absolution.

"Twelfthly, we believe that government, temporal law, courts, and regulations are to be respected wherever they may be; they are not to be condemned as some Papists and Anabaptists teach and hold. Moreover, we believe that a Christian, occupying a governmental position either by birth or by profession, can be saved by faith in Christ just as one who occupies the position of father or mother, husband or wife, is saved.

"Thirteenthly, we believe that tradition and human ordinances — spiritual or ecclesiastical — when they are not contrary to the plain Word of God, may or may not be observed. In these matters the wishes of our people should be observed in order to prevent unnecessary offense and in order to preserve peace. We also believe that the doctrine forbidding the marriage of priests is a doctrine of the devil. 1 Tim. 4:1, 2.

"Fourteenthly, we all believe with regard to the Lord's Supper that it ought to be celebrated in both kinds, according to its institution; that the Mass is not a work by which a Christian obtains pardon for another man, whether dead or alive; that the Sacrament of the Altar, too, is the Sacrament of the very body and blood of Jesus Christ; and that the spiritual manducation of this body and blood is highly necessary to every Christian. In like manner, as to the use of the Sacrament, we are agreed that, like the Word, it was ordained by Almighty God in order that weak consciences might be moved by the Holy Spirit to faith and to charity. Although at present we are not agreed on the question whether the true body and blood of Christ are bodily present in the bread and wine, yet each party should show Christian charity for the other, so far as conscience permits, and both parties earnestly implore Almighty God to confirm us by His Spirit in the sound doctrine. Amen.

"MARTINUS LUTHER
PHILIPPUS MELANCHTHON
JUSTUS JONAS
ANDREAS OSIANDER
JOHANNES BRENTIUS

STEPHANUS AGRICOLA
JOHANNES OECOLAMPADIUS
ULRICUS ZWINGLIUS
MARTINUS BUCERUS
CASPAR HEDIO" ⁹⁸⁾

98) *Dr. Martin Luthers Saemmtliche Schriften*, St. L., XVII, 1940—43.

Partial Bibliography

- Beard, Charles. *Martin Luther and the Reformation in Germany*. n. p. Kegan Paul, Trench and Company, 1889.
- Dau, W. H. T. *Four Hundred Years*. St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1916.
- D'Aubigné, J. H. M. *History of the Great Reformation of the Sixteenth Century in Germany, Switzerland, Etc.* New York, Wm. H. Colyer, 1846.
- Eells, Hastings. *Martin Bucer*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1931.
- Engelder, Th.; Arndt, W.; Graebner, Th.; Mayer, F. E. *Popular Symbolics*. St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1934.
- Jackson, S. M. *Selected Works of Huldreich Zwingli*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania, 1901.
- Jackson, S. M. *Huldreich Zwingli*. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1900.
- Jackson, S. M. *The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. New York, Funk and Wagnalls, 1910.
- Kidd, B. U. *Documents of the Continental Reformation*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911.
- Koehler, Walther, *Das Marburger Religionsgespräch 1529*. Leipzig, M. Heinsius Nachfolger Eger und Sievers, 1929.
- Lindsay, F. M. *History of the Reformation*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.
- Mackinnon, James. *Luther and the Reformation*. London, Longmans, Green and Company, 1929.
- Proceedings of the Thirty-Fifth Convention of the Evangelical Lutheran Synodical Conference of North America, August 6—11, 1936*. St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1936.
- Qualben, Lars. *A History of the Christian Church*. New York, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1933.
- Richard, J. W. *Philip Melancthon*. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1898.
- Schirrmacher, F. W. *Briefe und Acten zur Geschichte des Religionsgespräches zu Marburg 1529*. Gotha, Friedrich Andreas Perthes, 1876.
- Schmidt, L. K. *Das Religionsgespräch zu Marburg 1529*. Marburg, 1840.
- Smith, Preserved. *Life and Letters of Martin Luther*. New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1911.
- Smith, Preserved. *The Age of the Reformation*. New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1920.
- Walker, W. *The Reformation*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.
- Cambridge Modern History, II*. Cambridge University Press, 1934.
- Austin, Tex. GEORGE JOHN BETO



Syntactical Peculiarities in Revelation

"I see his dialect and language not accurately conforming to Greek, I see him making use of idioms of foreign turn and here and there even tending to solecism." So wrote Dionysius Magnus.¹⁾

Since the days of Dionysius Magnus, the style and language employed by the author of Revelation has been variously assessed. Among modern writers on the subject the opinions of Moulton, Swete, Benson, Debrunner, Charles, Howard, Robertson, Radermacher, and Lohr are particularly noteworthy.

Moulton²⁾ writes, "Even the Greek of the Apocalypse does not seem to owe any of its blunders to Hebraism. . . . The author's uncertain use of cases is obvious to the most casual reader. . . . We find him perpetually indifferent to concord. But the less educated papyri give us plentiful parallels from a field where Semitism cannot be suspected. . . . Apart from places where he may be definitely translating a Semitic document, there is no reason to believe that his grammar would have been materially different had he been a native of Oxyrhynchus, assuming the extent of Greek education the same." In a footnote on page nine of the same work, Moulton says, "It will not do to appeal to grammar to prove that the author was a Jew: as far as that goes, he might just as well have been a farmer of the Fayum. Thought and material must exclusively determine that question."

Swete³⁾ does not agree with Moulton. He allows for the possibility that the early years of thinking in a Semitic language were responsible for some of John's stylistic eccentricities in Revelation. His final summary is: "From whatever cause or concurrence of causes, it cannot be denied that the Apocalypse of John stands alone among Greek literary writings in its disregard of the ordinary rules of syntax and the success with which syntax is set aside without loss of perspicuity or even of literary power. The book seems openly and deliberately to defy the grammarian, and yet, even as literature, it is in its own field unsurpassed. No judge who compared it with any other Greek apocalyptic work would hesitate to give the palm to the canonical Apocalypse."

Benson⁴⁾ allows for only a few solecisms in Revelation and attempts to show that the author wrote largely κατὰ σύνεσιν (according to the reader's comprehension of truth).

1) Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, VII, 25.

2) J. H. Moulton, *Prolegomena*, 8 f.

3) H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, 115—125.

4) E. W. Benson, *The Apocalypse*, Essay V: A Grammar of Ungrammar.

Debrunner ⁵⁾ writes, "Of all New Testament authors, the writer of Revelation writes the most commonplace style" ("am vulgaersten schreibt der Verfasser der Apokalypse"). "Revelation, as compared with the other New Testament books and the other writings of John, shows a number of very conspicuous solecisms which rest chiefly on neglect of concord." With respect to the possibility of Semitic influence on Revelation, Debrunner believes that translation Greek is to be found 1) in the LXX and therefore in quotations from the LXX occurring in Revelation; 2) in those writings of the New Testament which probably rest on an Aramaic original (parts of the synoptic Gospels and of Revelation).

Charles ⁶⁾ devotes ten pages to a discussion of the Hebraic style of the Apocalypse. His position is: "While the author writes in Greek, he thinks in Hebrew, and the thought has naturally affected the vehicle of expression." Charles then proceeds to make out a strong case for the contention that the Hebrew idiom lies behind the Greek of Revelation.

Howard ⁷⁾ agrees substantially with Charles, but poses the question: "The writer's familiarity with Hebrew seems to lie beyond question, but why should not Aramaic be his mother tongue, the language in which his thoughts would first frame themselves?" He believes that the solution of the linguistic problem in Revelation lies in the combination of the following factors:

1. a mind that thought in Aramaic and found in the Greek vernacular of his world many idioms sufficiently close to his mother tongue for his purpose;
2. sources in translated Greek and Hebrew, which he worked into his book in Hebraic Greek;
3. a knowledge of the LXX and of various apocalypses already current in a Greek form, which supplied him with a vocabulary and often suggested an idiom.

His statement: "More importance should be allowed to the influence of the LXX" (484) seems particularly pertinent.

Robertson ⁸⁾ takes the position: "The syntactical peculiarities are due partly to *constructio ad sensum* and *variatio structurae*. The solecisms in the Apocalypse are chiefly cases of anacolutha. . . . Moulton denies that the Apocalypse has any Hebraisms. That is possibly going too far the other way, for the book is saturated with the apocalyptic images and phrases of Ezekiel and Daniel

5) Blass-Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, sixth edition (1931), 83, 84.

6) R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of St. John*, I, 142—152.

7) Moulton and Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, II, 484 f.

8) A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, fourth edition (1923), 135—36; 413—16.

and is very much like the other Jewish apocalypses. It is not so much particular Hebraisms that meet us in the Apocalypse as the flavor of the LXX, whose words are interwoven in the text at every turn."

Radermacher⁹⁾ observes: "No New Testament writer regards himself sufficiently free to despise what is grammatically permissible. Revelation only is an exception, inasmuch as it totally disregards all rules of concord ("indem sie sich ueber alle Regeln der Kongruenz einfach hinwegsetzt"). Following a brief discussion of Rev. 1:4, 5, in which he points out syntactical peculiarities in these two verses, Radermacher says, "This style is not bound to grammatical rules. But its hardness is of a monumental character, and it is not proper to compare with it crudities in the papyri letters" ("seine Starrheit ist monumental, und es empfiehlt sich nicht, damit die Stuempereien der Papyrusbriefe zu vergleichen").

Rohr¹⁰⁾ concludes, "Revelation speaks the common language of the first century with a pronounced touch of the later *Koine*. . . . The style reflects here and there a certain degree of poverty but also a richness which is capable of providing for every situation and mood the corresponding form, and acquaintance with grammatical rules coupled with a sovereign contempt of these rules. One or the other of the stylistic peculiarities appears here and there in contemporary profane literature, but never with such deliberate logic. Its peculiarity derives not only from the intimate familiarity of the author with the Prophets, for he has taken over from them not only his imagery, but also his mode of expression. And, finally, his native tongue was, like theirs, the Hebrew. Some peculiarities may be explained only as Hebraisms." Lohr then lists ten peculiarities which he regards as Semitisms. Yet, so Lohr believes, the seer was preserved from a one-sided Hebraizing tendency because of the realistic character of his subject matter. In the Gospel we have calm reflection, but in Revelation the excitation and ecstasy of the seer. John continues in this mood, and, as a result of it, his native Aramaic idiom bursts the shackles of his acquired Greek idiom" ("Im Evangelium spricht die ruhige Ueberlegung, in der Apokalypse zittert die Erregung der Ekstase des Sehers und seiner Erschuetterung durch das Geschaute nach, und in dieser Erregung sprengt das heimisch aramaeische Idiom die Regeln des Angelernten, des Griechischen").

From the above analyses of the style and language of Revelation it is evident that investigators are by no means in entire agreement, the chief contention being the relation of the language of

9) Ludwig Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*, 223.

10) Ignaz Rohr, *Der Hebraeerbrief und die Geheime Offenbarung des heiligen Johannes*, 67-69.

Revelation to a Semitic idiom. Though Charles and Howard have made careful studies in this field, an exhaustive investigation is still a desideratum. The solution of the problem seems to lie in further researches in the LXX, and, if it were to be discovered, in Aramaic literature of the two centuries before the Christian era.

Since I undertook this study with the purpose of gaining a general overview of the syntactical peculiarities in Revelation, I did not devote very much effort to a study of Semitisms in Revelation. In this paper I am merely classifying and illustrating various kinds of syntactical irregularities in Revelation, commenting on some, and calling attention here and there to parallels in papyri from the Hellenistic and the early Christian period. Where I believed an irregularity to be due to Semitic influence, I noted it.

In presenting my findings I am not following a pattern set by one or more grammarians, one reason being that there still exists some uncertainty as to what constitutes syntax. Another reason is that the varieties of syntactical irregularities in Revelation seem to defy all attempts at classification. I have studiously avoided commenting on cases commonly classified by Germans under "Lautlehre" and "Wortlehre."

I. Violations of concord (case, gender, number, person).

Repeatedly we find in Revelation an apposition in the nominative in place of an oblique case. Such irregularities appear also here and there in other New Testament books, but only rarely.¹¹⁾

The participle, in particular, violates accepted standards. "Its range in later times becomes more and more uncertain, and the masculine nominative singular gains complete ascendancy. In modern Greek the participle has only *one* indeclinable form in -ντας (nom)." ¹²⁾

Examples:

- 1:5: ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός
- 2:20: τὴν γυναῖκα Ἰεζάβελ, ἡ λέγουσα ἑαυτὴν προφητιν
- 3:12: τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἡ καταβαίνουσα
- 7:9: ὄχλος . . . ἐστῶτες περιβεβλημένοις
- 8:9: τὸ τρίτον τῶν πλοίων διεφθάρσαν
- 9:12: ἔρχεται ἔτι δύο Οὐαί (previously ἡ Οὐαί, therefore not neuter)
- 9:14: λέγουσα τῷ ἔκτῳ ἀγγέλῳ ὁ ἔχων τὴν σάλπιγγα
- 11:4: αἱ δύο λυχνίδαι αἱ . . . ἐστῶτες
- 12:5: ἄρσεν (in apposition to preceding ὕδιν)
- 14:12: ἡ ὑπομονὴ τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν, οἱ τηροῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ
- 14:19: εἰς τὴν ληνὸν . . . τὸν μέγαν
- 21:9: τὰς ἐπὶ φιάλας τῶν γεμόντων (in place of τὰς γεμούσας)

11) Blass-Debrunner, *op. cit.*, 137, 3.

12) Radermacher, *op. cit.*, 86 ff.; Albert Thumb, *Die Griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*, 131.

Charles regards some of the cases cited as Semitisms, since in Hebrew a noun or phrase standing in apposition remains unchanged. This rule applies, according to Charles, especially to the Hebrew participle if this is preceded by the article (cf. above 2:20; 3:12; 9:14; 14:12). If the article is absent, the author follows, so Charles believes, the Greek idiom, as in the following examples:

7:2: καὶ εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον ἀναβαίνοντα . . . ἔχοντα σφραγίδα θεοῦ ζῶντος

9:17: εἶδον τοὺς ὑπαικοὺς ἐν τῇ ὁράσει καὶ τοὺς καθημένους ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἔχοντας θώρακας πυρίνους

13:1: εἶδον . . . θηρίον ἀναβαῖνον ἔχον κέρατα δέκα

14:6: εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον πετόμενον . . . ἔχοντα εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον

15:2: εἶδον ὡς θάλασσαν ὑαλίνην . . . καὶ τοὺς νικῶντας ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου . . . ἐστῶτας . . . ἔχοντας

18:1: εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον . . . ἔχοντα ἔξουσίαν μεγάλην

20:1: εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον . . . ἔχοντα τὴν κλεῖν

With respect to the participle ἔχων, which in some instances does not follow the rule just given, Charles comments "ἔχων follows an accusative though it is not preceded by the article in 5:6: ἄρνιον ἐστηκὸς . . . ἔχων (see also 14:14). In 5:6 it seems corrupt for ἔχων. In 14:14 ἔχων is correct and καθημένον ὅμοιον, which precedes, is a slip for the nominative" (!?).

Whether Charles is right in saying that some violations of concord in Revelation are due to the Hebrew idiom, is still debatable. The fact of the matter is that one finds this irregularity very often in the papyri.¹³⁾

From Mayser I cite the following:

Zen. pap. 59443, 12: ἀπεστάλκαμέν σοι γυναῖκα φέρων σοι τὴν ἐπιστολήν

Zen. pap. 59665:8: ταινίαν μέλαιναν ἔχων πλάτος δακτύλων δύο

Zen. pap. 59665, 10: καὶ κόχλον ναυτικὸν ἔχων πλάτος δακτύλων δέκα

UPZ 78:12: ἤκουσα Τοῦθ' ἔλεγον

UPZ 78, 25: ἐμὲ δὲ ἄφες, εἰδού (-ιδού), πολίας ἔχων

Similar examples may be found in Kapsomenakis.¹⁴⁾

I note the following:

Flor I 50, 66: σὺν τοῖς ἐνοῦσι φοίνιξι καὶ φυτοῖς πᾶσι καὶ συκαμινέων ὄντων

PSI VIII 903, 19: τῆς ἐνεστῶτος ἡμέρας

Deserving special comment are the participles λέγων and λέγοντες. These forms are obviously renderings of the Hebrew דִּבֶּרֶךְ

13) Cf. Moulton, *op. cit.*, 90; Radermacher, *op. cit.*, 106 f.; Blass-Debrunner, *op. cit.*, § 136, 1; Edwin Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemaeerzeit*, II, 3, p. 192 ff. For examples from later Greek see A. N. Jannaris, *An Historical Greek Grammar*, § 1181 b.

14) Stylianos G. Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri der nachchristlichen Zeit*, 40 f.

and occur in the LXX (cf. Gen. 15:1; 22:20; 38:13; 45:16; 48:20, etc.). Thus used, they are indeclinable. There is reason to suppose that these forms were perhaps among the first to violate concord and thus set a pattern for other participles which in course of time became indeclinable. Cf. UPZ 78, 12: ἤκουσα Τοῦθ' λέγων.

A few examples from Revelation are the following:

4:1: ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη ἦν ἤκουσα ὡς σάλπιγγος λαλούσης μετ' ἐμοῦ λέγων

11:15: καὶ ἐγένοντο φωναὶ μεγάλαί ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ λέγοντες

14:6, 7: εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον . . . λέγων ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ

II. The resumptive pronoun.

Frequently the construction in Revelation is disturbed by the addition of a personal pronoun (occasionally an adverb of place) after a relative or participial clause.¹⁵⁾

Charles regards this a Semitism, commenting, "The pronoun is pleonastic in Greek, though not in Hebrew, where, since the pronoun is uninflected, it supplies the inflection needed." Examples in New Testament books other than Revelation are: Mark 1:7; 7:25; John 1:27; Acts 15:17. Debrunner recognized the relation of this peculiarity to the Hebrew וְ... וְ... and the Aramaic וְ... וְ... , but he also attributes this redundant use of the pronoun to carelessness of speech not unknown in classical Greek and very common in the Hellenistic period.

Examples from Revelation are:

3:8: δέδωκα . . . θύραν . . ., ἣν οὐδεὶς δύναται κλεῖσαι αὐτήν

6:4: καὶ τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐδόθη αὐτῷ λαβεῖν τὴν εἰρήνην

7:2: οἱ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἀδικῆσαι τὴν γῆν

7:9: ἰδοὺ ὄχλος πολὺς, ὃν ἀριθμῆσαι αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο

12:6: ὅπου ἔχει ἐκεῖ τόπον (Heb. וְ... וְ...)

13:8: οὗ οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς

13:12: οὗ ἐθεραπεύθη ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ

17:9: αἱ ἑπτὰ κεφαλαὶ ἑπτὰ ὄρη εἰσὶν, ὅπου ἡ γυνὴ κάθηται ἐπ' αὐτῶν

20:8: ὃν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης

Here must be added a word about the frequent use of the *hanging nominative* in Revelation. Though this construction appears here and there in New Testament books other than Revelation, as in Matt. 12:36 and Luke 12:10, and though it is a frequent phenomenon in classical and especially in Hellenistic Greek,¹⁶⁾ Charles believes that its frequency in Revelation is due to the LXX, which borrowed it from the Hebrew. It should be noted, however, that the author of Revelation seems fully aware of this construc-

15) Radermacher, *op. cit.*, 217; Moulton-Howard, *op. cit.*, 423 f.

16) Radermacher, *op. cit.*, 21 f.

tion, since he occasionally avoids it where one would expect him to employ it (cf. 2:7, 17). A few instances of the hanging nominative in Revelation are:

- 2:26: ὁ νικῶν καὶ ὁ τηρῶν . . . δώσω αὐτῷ
 3:12: ὁ νικῶν ποιήσω αὐτὸν στῦλον
 3:21: ὁ νικῶν δώσω αὐτῷ καθίσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ

III. *The resolution of the participle in one of the oblique cases, or of an infinitive into a finite verb in the following clause, which finite verb should have been rendered idiomatically in Greek by a participle or by an infinitive respectively.*

Charles regards this a Hebrew idiom and says that it cannot be explained from the vernacular Greek. He refers to Driver, *Hebrew Tenses* (163). The idiom occurs in the LXX, as in Gen. 27:33; Is. 14:17; Is. 5:8, 23; Ezek. 22:3, and elsewhere. Examples in New Testament books other than Revelation are: 2 John 2 and Col. 1:26. Howard has adopted Charles' explanation.¹⁷⁾

Examples in Revelation are:

- 1:5, 6: τῷ ἀγαπῶντι ἡμᾶς καὶ λύσαντι ἡμᾶς . . . καὶ ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν
 1:17, 18: ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος καὶ ὁ ζῶν καὶ ἐγενόμην νεκρὸς (some scholars, so Charles says, have misrepresented this, and others, like Wellhausen, have excised τὸ ζῶν). The passage is translated by Charles, "Fear not: I am the first and the last and He that liveth and was dead."
 2:2: καὶ ἐπείρασας τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ οὐκ εἶσιν
 2:9: οἶδα . . . τὴν βλασφημίαν ἐκ τῶν λεγόντων Ἰουδαίους εἶναι ἑαυτοὺς, καὶ οὐκ εἶσιν, ἀλλὰ συναγωγὴ τοῦ σατανᾶ
 2:20: ὅτι ἀφείς τὴν γυναῖκα Ἰεζάβελ ἡ λέγουσα ἑαυτὴν προφῆτιν, καὶ διδάσκει καὶ πλανᾷ τοὺς ἐμους δούλους
 2:23: ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἐραυνῶν . . . καὶ δώσω
 3:9: διδῶ ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τοῦ σατανᾶ τῶν λεγόντων ἑαυτοὺς Ἰουδαίους εἶναι, καὶ οὐκ εἶσιν, ἀλλὰ ψεύδονται
 7:14: οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐρχόμενοι ἐκ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς μεγάλης καὶ ἔπλυναν τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐλεύκαναν αὐτάς . . .
 14:2, 3: ἡ φωνὴ ἦν ἡκουσα ὡς κιθαρωδῶν καθαριζόντων ἐν ταῖς καθάραις αὐτῶν καὶ ᾄδουσιν ᾠδὴν καινὴν
 15:2, 3: καὶ εἶδον . . . τοὺς νικῶντας . . . ἐστῶτας . . . ἔχοντας . . . καὶ ᾄδουσιν τὴν ᾠδὴν Μωϋσέως . . .
 20:4: πεπελεκισμένων . . . καὶ οἵτινες οὐ προσεκύνησαν (Charles believes, though he has no textual evidence, that the οἵτινες is a late insertion).

17) Moulton-Howard, *op. cit.*, 429.

As an example of the resolution of an infinitive into a finite verb I append the following:

13:15: καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῇ δοῦναι . . . καὶ ποιήσῃ

IV. *The joining of different tenses and moods without any clear reason for the change; the partiality for the perfect tense, especially in the case of εἶρηκα (7:14; 19:3) and εἴληφα (2:28; 3:3; 5:7; 8:5; 11:17).¹⁸⁾*

That there are traces in the New Testament of the late vernacular historical perfect is admitted by Robertson¹⁹⁾ and by Debrunner.²⁰⁾

The latter refers to 5:7 (ἦλθεν καὶ εἴληφεν) and 8:5 (εἴληφεν . . . καὶ ἐγέμισεν); also to 7:14, where some texts have εἶπον. Other examples from Revelation are:

2:2 f.: ἐπείρασας . . . ἔχεις . . . ἐβάστασας . . . κεκοπίακας

3:9: ποιήσω αὐτοὺς ἵνα ἤξουσιν καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν . . . καὶ γνώσιν

9:5: ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτούς, ἀλλ' ἵνα βασανισθῶσιν αὐτοὶ

21:24 ff.: περιπατήσουσιν . . . φέρουσιν . . . οὐ μὴ κλεισθῶσιν . . . οἴσουσιν . . . οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῇ

V. *The bold substantivizing of such words as participles, interjections, and letters of the alphabet.*

Examples:

1:4 ἀπὸ ὃ ὦν καὶ ὃ ἦν καὶ ὃ ἐρχόμενος

1:8: ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦν

9:12 and 11:14: ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ μία, ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ δευτέρα, ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ τρίτη

Of special interest is 1:4. The name of God, ὃ ὦν καὶ ὃ ἦν καὶ ὃ ἐρχόμενος (arranged chronologically in 4:8: ὃ ἦν καὶ ὃ ὦν καὶ ὃ ἐρχόμενος) rests according to Debrunner²¹⁾ and Howard²²⁾ on the current exegesis of Ex. 3:14.²³⁾

The name of God is deliberately left in the nominative after ἀπὸ²⁴⁾ "in order to preserve the immutability and absoluteness of the divine name from declension."²⁵⁾

For a fuller discussion see an article by Debrunner in *Goett. Gel. Anz.*, 1926, 147 f.

18) Moulton, *Die Sprache des Neuen Testaments*, 225—31, where he discusses the problem with special reference to εἴληφα, ἔσχηκα, πέπραχα, and γέγονα.

19) *Op. cit.*, 898—902.

20) *Op. cit.*, § 343, 1.

21) *Op. cit.*, § 143 and p. 297 f.

22) *Op. cit.*, 154.

23) Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, III, 788; LXX ὃ ὦν = אֱשֶׁר אֵלֶיךָ.

24) "An intentional tour de force," Moulton, *Prolegomena*, 9.

25) James Moffatt, quoted by Howard, *op. cit.*, 154.

On the other hand, proper names were frequently not declined in the Hellenistic period, not even after the prepositions *διά*, *εἰς*, *παρά*, *περί*, and *ὑπέρ*, as Mayser has convincingly demonstrated.²⁶⁾

VI. *The author of Revelation repeats the article or the preposition before every member of a series for, so it seems, no particular reason.*

Examples:

- 9:20: τὰ εἰδωλα τὰ χρυσᾶ καὶ τὰ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ τὰ χαλκᾶ καὶ τὰ λίθινα καὶ τὰ ξύλινα
 15:2: τοὺς νικῶντας ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου καὶ ἐκ τῆς εἰκόνης αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ
 16:13: ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ δράκοντος καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ θηρίου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ ψευδοπροφήτου
 17:6: μεθύουσιν ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν μαρτύρων Ἰησοῦ

VII. *The author is very fond of the instrumental dative preceded by ἐν. A few examples will suffice.*

- 2:16: ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ
 2:27; 12:5; 19:15: ἐν ῥάβδῳ
 14:2: ἐν ταῖς καθάραις
 16:8; 17:16: ἐν πυρί

VIII. *The writer of Revelation more so than any other New Testament author favors the transition in a final clause from the subjunctive to the future indicative. While, according to Radermacher (216), one finds such instances even in Plato and Herodotus, the usage of a future indicative after ἵνα and μή becomes a very common practice in the Koine.²⁷⁾*

Examples from Revelation:

- 3:9: ἵνα ἤξουσιν καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν
 6:4: καὶ ἵνα ἀλλήλους σφάζουσιν
 9:4: ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς ἵνα μὴ ἀδικήσουσιν
 9:20: ἵνα μὴ προσκυνήσουσιν
 14:13: ναί, λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα, ἵνα ἀναπαήσονται

Note: The rich and varied use of *ἵνα* in Revelation (also in John's Gospel) requires special investigation. The subject is too large to be discussed here.

IX. *Peculiar constructions in Revelation which seem to rest on a Hebrew or Aramaic idiom.* Charles lists a substantial number of such constructions. I have selected only those which seemed convincing:

26) Mayser, *op. cit.*, II, 2, § 368, 8.

27) See also Debrunner, *op. cit.*, § 369.

a. 12:7: ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ τοῦ πολεμῆσαι μετὰ τοῦ δράκοντος. Charles translates this verse: "Michael and his angels had to fight with the dragon." Debrunner (§ 400) questions, on good authority, the genuineness of the τοῦ which precedes πολεμῆσαι and regards the nominative ὁ Μιχαὴλ a poetic license, which the writer employed in place of using the genitive or dative. On p. 315, however, Debrunner agrees with Charles and with Howard (448 f.) that the τοῦ πολεμῆσαι is a translation of the Hebrew imperative ל followed by the infinitive. Charles and Howard both cite Hos. 9:13 (LXX). Howard also refers to Ps. 25:14; 1 Chron. 9:25; and Eccles. 3:15. He also quotes Guillemard (*Hebraisms in the Greek Testament*), who says, p. 3, in connection with Matt. 2:6: "An apt example of the practice almost universal in the LXX, of rendering ל with infinitive, after neuter or passive verbs, by τοῦ with the infinitive; to the loss very often of all intelligibility or sense. . . . The translators appear to have concluded that a Greek idiom, which was the appropriate interpretation of the Hebrew idiom under certain conditions, was always to be employed as its equivalent and so have introduced into their version renderings which are otherwise inexplicable. And to this we owe, in great measure, the strange and startling instances of the τοῦ with infinitive, occasionally met with in the New Testament."²⁸⁾

One is inclined to agree with Charles and Howard, because of the few instances in Revelation of τοῦ with the infinitive the function of none is clearly established.²⁹⁾

b. 4:9, 10: ὅταν δώσουσιν τὰ ζῶα . . . πεσοῦνται οἱ εἴκοσι . . . πρεσβύτεροι . . . καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ ζῶντι . . . καὶ βαλοῦσιν τοὺς στεφάνους. . . . The future tenses must here be rendered by the present, for they represent the Hebrew imperfect in a frequentative sense.

c. 6:16: κρύνετε ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ. . . . The ἀπὸ is the rendering for מִן. The entire phrase (it occurs also 12:14 and 20:11) is the rendering for יִכְסֶּה

d. 19:5: αἰνεῖτε τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν. Αἰνεῖτε with the dative in 19:5 is well established in the LXX. There it occurs with the dative for לַיהוָה and לַלֵּל

X. Other syntactical peculiarities:

1:13; 14:14: ὁμοιον υἱόν (acc.). Debrunner regards this a solecism.³⁰⁾

28) Howard, *op. cit.*, p. 449.

29) Radermacher, *op. cit.*, 189.

30) *Op. cit.*, § 182, 4 note.

Ordinarily the writer of Revelation uses the dative with *δμοιος*, as in 2:18.

3:17: οὐδὲν χρεῖαν ἔχω. Though Debrunner regards the construction possible, he does not think it probable.³¹⁾

Some important readings have οὐδενός.

8:4: ἀνέβη ὁ καπνὸς ταῖς προσευχαῖς. Perhaps the dative is one of interest, though other interpretations are suggested.³²⁾

13:3: ἐθαυμάσθη ὁπίσω τοῦ θηρίου. Debrunner reconstructs this difficult reading as follows: ἐθαύμασαν ἐπὶ τῷ θηρίῳ καὶ ἐπορεύθη ὁπίσω αὐτοῦ (§ 196). Howard regards it a Semitism (476).

8:13: οὐαὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

12:12: οὐαὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν. Οὐαὶ with the accusative is no doubt the true reading in 8:13 and 12:12. Debrunner suggests its combination with the accusative or with the dative (Matt. 11:21) may be analogous to the Latin *vae me* or *vae mihi* (§ 190, 2).

16:10: ἐμασῶντο τὰς γλώσσας αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ πόνου. The *ἐκ* used in phrases such as this to express the cause by which an act is aided, sustained, or effected is exceedingly common in Revelation as well as in John's Gospel and in the First Epistle of John.³³⁾

This concludes this brief examination of some of the peculiarities of style in Revelation. The examination is in no sense a criticism. Who are we imperfect mortals to find fault with the language of any Biblical writer? What impresses us rather is that when John, under the Spirit's guidance, attempted to put in writing the grand visions revealed to him, he felt compelled here and there to burst the shackles of accepted form, to give priority to his Aramaic idiom, to draw on the translation Greek of the LXX, and in other ways, like a great poet, allow himself a large measure of freedom of speech, which one may admire but not emulate. Revelation is the striking example in the New Testament of the truth that while the Holy Spirit ordinarily had the sacred writers comply with accepted regularities of style, He did not make them mechanical slaves of such regularities. These very stylistic peculiarities do not detract from, but rather enhance, the value of Revelation.

PAUL M. BRETSCHER

31) *Op. cit.*, § 154.

32) Debrunner, *op. cit.*, § 188, 1.

33) Cf. Debrunner, *op. cit.*, § 212.

Outlines on Gospels Adopted by Synodical Conference

Quinquagesima

Matt. 20:17-28

This lesson has from ancient times formed the introduction to the Lenten season, with its solemn announcement concerning the going up to Jerusalem. Certain attendant factors emphasize this solemnity: the fact that the Savior had fully decided upon this course of action, that He took the Twelve apart from other people, that He introduced His announcement with the significant "Behold!" — It is in this spirit that we also should make ready to accompany Jesus on His journey to Jerusalem and to Calvary.

Christ Preparing to Die

1. *As our Savior*
2. *As our Example*

1

A. The beginning of the last great journey and the preparations for the atoning sacrifice of the Savior. Vv. 17-19.

a. The announcement, as Luke notes, chap. 18:31, made special mention of the fact that the work of the atonement was begun in keeping with God's arrangements as written by the Prophets. The trip to Jerusalem, with its culmination in the miracle of Calvary, was not a matter of chance, but of God's planning, in which the Son concurred.

b. Christ here uses the name which characterizes His person in a most unique way: "Son of Man," employed almost exclusively by Him, and signifying, in this instance, that His human nature would bear the sufferings which were associated with His atoning work.

c. The prediction of the Savior includes all the chief elements along the way of redemption. Describe them.

It is a source of satisfaction and comfort to every Christian to know that the work of atonement, as wrought by Christ, was not a matter of blind chance and circumstance, but the culmination of a plan worked out in the council of the Godhead from eternity.

B. The significance and the eternal value of Christ's atoning work. V. 28.

a. Christ is the eternal Son of God, as He frequently stated and proved also during His earthly life. He might, therefore, have demanded service to Himself, He might have ruled by virtue of His almighty power.

b. Instead of that, He carries out the work of atonement through service. He becomes the unique "Servant of Jehovah." Is. 53. And

in this capacity He gives Himself into death. And it is a vicarious death, in the stead, in the place of many, of all men, with special reference to those who, by His grace, would accept the fruits of the atonement. 1 Tim. 4:10.

Again we see that the work of atonement is full of the comfort which sustains our faith and brings Christ close to our hearts.

2

A. The foolishness of the wife of Zebedee and her sons. Vv. 20-30.

a. The request shows a total ignorance of the real significance of Christ's important announcement. In the face of the Savior's imminent death these three seek preferment above others, not realizing that utter unselfishness is basic for the right form of discipleship.

b. The Savior's searching words with regard to the drinking of the cup of suffering did not effect the desired result, since the two disciples blandly assert that they felt themselves fully capable of sharing in the sufferings of their Master. It was a blindness frequently shown by even such as may mean well in their Christianity.

c. The Savior's gentle correction, in the endeavor to make them realize what was really at stake in the ordeal which He saw before Him.

d. The indignation of the other disciples, prompted probably by the frustrated ambition which they felt in their own hearts.

The two disciples as well as the rest are examples of a false understanding of Christ's atoning work, associated doubtless with notions of earthly power and glory. This attitude must be far from every true Christian's mind.

B. The lesson which Christ attaches to the incident. Vv. 24-27.

a. The reference to the manner in which the great and mighty of the world try to make use of their power, in lording it over others, in arrogating authority to themselves.

b. The characteristics of true discipleship of Christ: the great one to become a servant, he who occupies first position to be ready for the work of a slave, for a life of humble service.

c. The work of Christ's vicarious atonement and He Himself the perfect example of the relationship which should exist between Christians by virtue of their being members together in Christ.

It is only by understanding the example of Christ in this manner that Christians will derive the greatest benefit, not only for their faith, but also for their conduct toward one another from the Lenten story.

P. E. KRETZMANN

Invocavit**Luke 4:1-15**

Exactly 399 years ago today (Feb. 18, 1546) Luther died. No one since the Apostles has given greater impetus to faithful, proper use of Scripture.

"God will not deal with us except through His external Word and Sacrament," he said, "and whatever proudly introduces itself as the Spirit instead of the Word and Sacrament is *the very devil*. (Smalc. Art., Pt. III, Art. VIII.)

How true — can be seen in the text, which strikingly illustrates

Various Ways of Using Scripture**1. The way of Satan.**

Text: Yes, even Satan, the archdeceiver, knows and uses Scripture. Hearing Jesus quote, he also quoted the Bible. Unsuccessful in the first temptation, he bolstered the second with Ps. 91:11. But Jesus was not deceived. He noticed (1) that Satan was *mutilating* text, omitting "in all thy ways"; and (2) that he was *misapplying* text to something never intended. The promise of Psalm 91 was meant to encourage faith, not presumption, such as to cast oneself from pinnacle. Yet that is Satan's way of using Scripture.

Applications: To confirm their false views, many individuals and churches pursue the same method.

A. They mutilate texts; either omit or add something. Ex.: When Paul says, "All Scripture," 2 Tim. 3:16, they say, "Not all, only parts." When Jesus commands: "Baptize all nations," Matt. 28:19, they reply: "Not all, only adults." When Jesus declares: "This is," Matt. 26:26, they retort: "Not is, only signifies." Is that not the way of Satan? Hear what God says of such mutilation: "Take away . . . and I will," etc. Deut. 4:2; Rev. 22:18.

B. They misapply texts; apply it to things God never intended. Ex.: When discussing the way of salvation, some quote Lev. 20:7, though this is intended to teach knowledge of sin, Rom. 3:20. For the knowledge of salvation a different word is given: "Believe," Acts 16:31. — The Pope has used Acts 10:3, "Rise, Peter, kill," as proof of his authority to punish heretics, though here God speaks of animals. Is that not the way of Satan?

C. Watch, therefore! "Many false prophets," Matt. 24:24. Nor be deceived by the fact that they quote Scripture. Remember — even Satan did. And be careful never to stoop to his methods. A negligent Christian, when admonished, was heard quoting: "The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak." Imagine using that solemn word of the suffering Savior as an excuse for spiritual inertia! Is that not the way of Satan?

2. *The way of Jesus.*

Text: Every temptation He met with a text, saying, "It is written." To Him, certainly, the Scripture was God's mighty, infallible Word. Therefore, He used it (1) *to overcome temptation* and (2) *to combat error*. When Satan in the second temptation (Matthew's sequence) misquoted Scripture, Jesus exposed and annihilated the error *with Scripture*, saying: "It is written *again*," Matt. 4:7. That is Jesus' way.

Applications: Like Him we, His disciples, are to regard every word as given by the Holy Ghost and to use it as the "sword of the Spirit."

A. To overcome temptations. Ex.: Does the worldling tempt you by saying: A Christian may join in all the world's pleasures, then answer: It is written, "Love not the world," 1 John 2:15. — In your afflictions does someone say: God does not care for you? then answer: It is written, "God is faithful," 1 Cor. 10:13. In all situations and temptations think of a Bible verse. Ps. 119:9.

B. To combat error. When confronted with errorists, who also quote Scripture, what shall we do? Follow the example of Jesus and say: *Again* it is written! Ex.: Millennialists quote Rev. 20; answer them: Again it is written, Heb. 9:28. A frivolous youth, reprimanded by his mother, said: "Should I spend my life mourning? Doesn't the Bible say: 'Rejoice in your youth,' Eccl. 11:9a?" Mother answered: "So it does, but again it says immediately after: 'Judgment,' Eccl. 11:9b." That was using Scripture in the way of Jesus.

C. Oh, that all of us might become more adept and careful in the use of our Bibles! Imitate Jesus.

Oh, keep us in Thy Word, we pray,
The guile and rage of Satan stay!

ALVIN E. WAGNER

Reminiscere

John 12: 20-26

We assume that the disciples, as good missionaries and leaders, introduced the Greeks to Jesus, the Lamb of God. Then Jesus presented Himself to them as the grain of wheat about to be glorified in His person and office by His work and triumph for them and all mankind. He is glorified by glorifying us to glorify Him.

The Glorification of Jesus

1. By His death: He gave His life into death that we could become His glorifying people.

A grain of wheat bears hidden within itself life, vitality, power to cover after several years acres of ground by its own yield. In its golden harvest the original seed is glorified. This potential glory appears only on condition of the death and subsequent germination of the grain, after which the same life, the same vital principle, rises, but in a different form. The life in the harvest is the same life that was in the grain. The principle of the grain is used also 1 Cor. 15:36-38 with reference to the resurrection of our body. As the same body, so the same life rises. No animate being has two lives.

Here Jesus employs the type as an illustration (1) of His death and its necessity, (2) of His resurrection and its indispensableness, (3) toward the glorification of His own person.

But specifically Jesus refers to the harvest, the fruit of His death and resurrection, namely, the harvest of sinners converted to Him and eternally saved. These are His seed, His fruit. Is. 53:10-12; Ps. 22:26-31. — Already at this moment, while He was preparing to die, He was harvesting as the Hope of the Jews and of the Gentiles. Both are represented, vv. 20-22. — He advances the parable of the wheat to them (1) to show that the Fatherhood, Pentecost, the Kingdom, forgiveness, life, resurrection to life, heaven, is contingent on His death for us, His vicarious death, His death in our behalf; the grain dies for the purpose, and for the sake, of its seed; (2) to prepare them by this beautiful and comforting type against the offense of the Cross.

In His seed His person and work is glorified here on earth, Eph. 2:10; Titus 2:11-14, and there in heaven, Rev. 5:12.

A Christian laid a grain of wheat in a tiny dish where he could see it often to remind himself of the great debt of gratitude to Jesus. Next to this he placed in a useless dish the seed of a tare.

2. *By our life:* As glorified people we keep our life and devote it to Him.

We want to keep our life. We love it. Jesus does not condemn our desire to live. He is the Giver, Preserver, Protector. But He condemns the sinful love, selfish enjoyment, care and worry, of life. 1 John 2:15-17; Matt. 6:24-34. Such love of life is the loss of life by service to sin and by an unhappy death. Rom. 6:21, 23a. Its purpose, the glorification of Jesus by testimony, devotion, and service, is lost. It is empty, worthless, and remains so. Such a vain life we must hate by renouncing the world and its ways and by denying ourselves. Strange: Keeping life by hating life!

After their conversion Christians love their life for Jesus' sake. He has given it its glorious purpose, which is that they come so close to Him as to render personal service to Him (diakonos) in His household and Kingdom. That is the rich, successful life. It

is the desire of every grateful Christian. He wants to be, he is, fruitful. John 15:5, 16. As Christ's seed he wants to yield much fruit to the glory of the Savior.

In Christ, Col. 3:3, 4, we keep our life unto life eternal. Like body and soul, our life will be the same in eternity. We do not leave it behind to receive another life, a different one, there. We keep it eternally. However, like body and soul, it will be glorified. Temporal and eternal life is the same life except in point of perfection, of duration, knowledge, service, glory, v. 26b, 26c. 1 Cor. 13:9-12; Dan. 12:13; 2 Pet. 1:4; 1 Pet. 5:4; Rev. 20:6; Rom. 2:6, 7; Ps. 73:24; James 1:12; 2 Tim. 2:11, 12; 4:8. See Hymn 409.

G. H. SMUKAL

Oculi

John 2:13-25

Jesus went up to Jerusalem to attend the Passover, celebrated in the Temple, one of the most magnificent structures of antiquity. The Temple was very close to the heart of Jesus, His Father's house. At the age of 12 He loved to be there — His Father's business. Later He often taught in the Temple.

The Temple at Jerusalem was a type of the body of Jesus. "There stood side by side the beautiful type and the heavenly anti-type — the earthly sanctuary and the Son of God in His human body." Lenski. The Passover prefigured His suffering and death.

In the New Testament the Christian Church is the Temple of the living God, and every Christian heart is His dwelling place.

In the days of Jesus the Temple worship had been corrupted by formalism and commercialism.

We assemble regularly for worship.
What does Jesus see in *our* hearts?

Jesus Cleanses the Temple

1. *The earthly sanctuary*
2. *The inward temple of the heart*

1

V. 14. Deut. 14:24-26 permitted distant Jews to sell their animals at home and buy others at Jerusalem. The temple tax must be paid in Jewish coin. The priests had brought this business into the very court of the Temple, had made a stockyard out of it. The sacred Passover had become a great annual fair. Din and tumult disturbed worshipers.

Mal. 3:1 ff. Filled with holy indignation, Jesus formed a whip and drove the cattle vendors and their beasts out of the gates. Vv. 15, 16.

The divine majesty flashed from His features. None dared

resist Him. All should have been convinced that He was the Son of God, the Messiah. They refused to believe. Cf. John 11:47; 12:27. A committee from the authorities demands credentials, v. 18.

V. 19. Enigmatical sentence. This sign would be convincing even to them, but it would pronounce their doom rather than kindle faith in them. John 12:39 f. They were bent on rejecting Jesus and ruining themselves. "Destroy this Temple." Cf. John 13:27; Matt. 23:32. By rejecting Jesus they were even then destroying the real meaning and purpose of the Temple. Putting Him to death would result in destroying their earthly sanctuary and bringing judgment upon themselves, Matt. 26:64; 27:25.

The Temple has never been rebuilt. But Jesus raised up the temple of His body, v. 22. A sign of infinite grace for all believers, but a sign of judgment for His enemies. Matt. 12:38-40. He died and rose again that He might build His spiritual temple, John 11:50-52; 2 Cor. 6:16. In Jerusalem He showed holy zeal for His Father's house. He is filled with zeal for His spiritual temple today.

2

Every believer's heart a temple of God, Gal. 2:20; Eph. 3:17. Real purpose in cleansing Temple was to purify hearts. Mal. 3:2, 3. What does He see in the temple of our hearts? V. 25.

Materialism, earthly-mindedness? Minds overcharged with buying and selling, profit and gain? Do these things disturb our worship? Do we raise funds rather than win souls?

Formalism? Have we permitted the "deadly routine" of our church work to crowd out true spirituality?

Sign seeking? V. 18. 1 Cor. 1:22. "God must hear my prayers and fulfill my wishes, otherwise I will not believe." Sensation hunting? Not satisfied to sit quietly at Jesus' feet and hear His Word? Must we see something sensational: cripple healed right on the spot, man speaking with tongues, or even a message from the dead? Luke 16:31. We, too, are in danger of looking to signs, manifestations of God's power, rather than to the Word for the foundation of our faith, v. 23.

Jesus is ready to cleanse and purify our hearts. Rev. 3:17, 18. May the sign of His death and resurrection, the preaching of the Cross, ever be to us the power of God and the wisdom of God!

V. L. MEYER



Miscellanea

How Should a Congregation Solve the Problem of Delinquent Members?

(A Conference Essay)

Delinquent members are found in smaller or larger number in nearly every congregation. For the purpose of this paper we do not mean financially delinquent members, but members who are delinquent in church attendance and in partaking of the Lord's Supper. Such members are often spoken of as "dead timber" or "driftwood." However, since they are souls who are precious in the eyes of God, who are redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ, and whom the Savior wants in the mansions of His Father's house, I prefer to speak of them as delinquent members. It is my conviction that the existence of delinquents is, in the majority of cases, a reflection upon the congregation, which has failed in its duty to admonish an erring member as soon as irregularity began in the use of the means of grace. If every Christian in the congregation would sympathetically and charitably admonish a member as soon as he becomes delinquent, we would have a far healthier state of affairs in our congregations. But that does not obliterate the fact that nearly every congregation has delinquent members. How should a congregation solve this problem?

For a proper approach to this whole problem we must keep in mind that the local congregation is a divine institution. For this point we shall follow Dr. J. T. Mueller in his *Christian Dogmatics*. The Apostles and their followers consistently gathered the believers of a certain community into local congregations, or churches, and commonly instructed, admonished, and comforted them as such in their Epistles. Thus we read of "the church of God which is at Corinth" (1 Cor. 1:2), "the churches of Galatia" (Gal. 1:2), "the saints which are at Ephesus" (Eph. 1:1), "the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons" (Phil. 1:1), the seven churches mentioned in Rev. 2 and 3. The Book of Acts as well as the Epistles clearly set forth the truth that it is God's will and appointment that all believers living at one place should establish in their midst the public ministry and make diligent use of it by hearing and learning God's Word as it is proclaimed by the divinely called ministers. See Eph. 4:3-6; Acts 2:42-47; 20:18; Titus 1:5; Acts 14:23; 1 Pet. 5:2, 3; also Luke 10:16; John 8:47; Heb. 10:25. Furthermore, the Scriptures clearly teach that the Christians of one community should together celebrate Holy Communion, 1 Cor. 10:17; 11:26, and exercise the duties of Christian fellowship and love, 1 Cor. 1:10; 11:23; Acts 6:1-6; Col. 3:15, 16. And finally, the Scriptures make it clear that the Christians who have united to form a local church should not only privately reprove an erring brother, Matt. 18:15, 16, but also as a church, or congregation, rebuke and discipline impenitent sinners, Matt. 18:17; 1 Cor. 5:13. From these Scripture passages it must become clear that local congregations, which preach and teach

the Gospel and administer the Sacraments, are divine institutions (Muel-
ler, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 555 f.).

It is important that we keep this in mind when dealing with the rather frequent problem of delinquent members. Since the local congregation is a divine institution, it self-evidently follows that membership in the local congregation means membership in a divine institution. Membership in the local congregation therefore cannot be regarded as on the same plane with membership in the men's club, the ladies' aid, or the Walther League. When a Christian joins a local congregation, he becomes affiliated with an organization or institution which exists by divine right. Every member of a local Christian congregation should be made conscious of this fact; and who will deny that the emphasis on this phase of church membership has been sadly neglected in the past? Do our members, generally speaking, fully realize and duly appreciate the fact that their membership in the local church is a membership in a God-appointed institution?

We are now ready to proceed to the question: How, then, may membership in a local congregation be terminated?

Self-evidently death terminates such membership, for in death the soul of a Christian church member is taken from the Church Militant to the Church Triumphant.

Such membership may furthermore be terminated by removal. When a Christian church member moves away from the parish limitations of his congregation, he can no longer maintain an active membership and will therefore ordinarily request a peaceful release.

Membership in a Christian congregation may also be terminated by withdrawal. One whose name has appeared on the membership list may notify the congregation in writing, or he may declare before two or three witnesses, that he no longer regards himself a member of the congregation and that consequently his name should be stricken from the membership list. Such a delinquent should naturally be admonished in brotherly love; but if the admonition is fruitless, the congregation must regard him as "without" and conform to his wish. In such cases the final step in church discipline, according to Matt. 18, cannot be taken, because the respective delinquent has himself already severed his connection with the Christian congregation and must therefore be regarded as belonging to those of whom it is written 1 John 2:19: "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us." A public declaration of such fact should, of course, be made to the congregation, and the offender treated as one who is "without."

Finally, membership in the local Christian congregation may be terminated by excommunication, Matt. 18:15-17.

Now the question: May the board of elders, with the pastor's approval, strike the names of delinquent members from the list? Self-evidently not. The board of elders is not the congregation, and here the principle must apply: "*Quicquid omnes tangit, maxime in re salutari, ab omnibus debet curari*" (What concerns all, especially in matters of one's salvation, must be taken care of by all). Therefore also no con-

gregation should authorize its board of elders to take final action in the case of delinquent members, but the congregation itself should take that action, perhaps upon recommendation of its board of elders.

May the voters' assembly strike the names of delinquent members who have been previously notified by the board of elders that their names would be stricken in a given meeting unless they returned to active membership? I would say, No. We can easily understand that delinquent members put the Christian patience of a congregation to sore trial. But the fact that such delinquents at the time when they were admonished in a brotherly and evangelical manner did not express the wish that their names be stricken from the membership list surely indicates that they wish that membership to be continued. At the time of such admonition they may be asked directly whether they still regard themselves members of the congregation and N.N. as their pastor. But if they answer in the affirmative, the congregation must bear with them and continue its brotherly admonition. Dr. Theo. Laetsch writes: "If a former brother is a manifest and impenitent despiser of the Sacrament after continued proper and loving admonition and therefore cannot be regarded as a Christian, he must be excommunicated. But until that time he is a member, though an erring member, of the Christian congregation and is to be retained as such."

How, then, must a congregation deal with its delinquent members? It must first of all be conscious of the seriousness of spiritual delinquency. Rightly does Dr. J. H. C. Fritz state in his *Pastoral Theology*: "Despising the means of grace is a greater sin than most people imagine, because it is a sin against the remedy itself" (p. 239). Realizing the seriousness of spiritual delinquency, the pastor, individual members, and especially also the elders of the Christian congregation will admonish the erring member in a brotherly, evangelical manner. They will remind him of all that Christ Jesus out of love has done for him, perfectly fulfilling every letter of the Law in his stead, suffering, bleeding, and dying to atone for his sin and guilt, triumphantly rising again from the dead to show that God and the sinner are reconciled, majestically ascending into heaven, there to prepare a place also for him. They will remind him of the passages of God's Word, preferably letting him read them in his own Bible, which speak of hearing God's Word, using the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, meeting and worshiping with fellow Christians. From the Scriptures and in all patience they will point out to him that the local congregation is a divine institution and that consequently withdrawal amounts to a withdrawal from God's institution. They will show him from Scripture that the local congregation is in possession of the Office of the Keys and that by his delinquency in church attendance and partaking of the Lord's Supper he is robbing himself of the ministrations of this sacred office. Never should a Christian congregation wait with such admonition until the erring member has become settled and hardened in his sinful neglect. How long such admonition should be continued becomes a question of casuistry, for it will depend upon the spiritual maturity of the respective person, his reasons for being delinquent, his attitude toward the Word of God that is presented to him in brotherly admonition, etc. The

principle should be maintained that such brotherly admonition should continue until one of three things happens: 1. the delinquent returns to active church membership; 2. the delinquent declares himself no longer a member of the congregation; 3. the delinquent must be excommunicated for persistently living in the sin of neglecting the means of grace.

May God in His grace grant to us as pastors and to our congregations a rich measure of wisdom from on high and the guidance of His Holy Spirit to deal with this problem according to His Word and will. May He bless the efforts of every congregation for the salvation of precious, blood-bought souls. May He grant both us and our congregations always to keep in mind the truth of His holy Word: "There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth" (Luke 15:10).

Puyallup, Wash.

THEO. BRACKMANN

The Inerrancy of the Scriptures

On the inerrancy of the Scriptures the Rev. Vernon Grounds of Paterson, N. J., in a sermon preached over Station WPAT Jan. 16, 1944 (reprinted in the *Christian Beacon* of April 20), submits a number of valuable quotations constituting utterances of men of science who accepted or accept the Scriptures as being altogether without error. In dealing with people who accuse the Scriptures of being inaccurate in matters pertaining to the field of science, these quotations can render important service.

James Dwight Dana of Yale University, "probably the most eminent geologist America has yet produced," is here reported to have said to a graduating class: "Young men! As you go out into the world to face scientific problems, remember that I, an old man who has known only science all his life long, say to you that there is nothing truer in all the universe than the scientific statements contained in the Word of God."

Dr. Howard A. Kelly, "the versatile genius who was one of the four founders of Johns Hopkins University at Baltimore," said in the course of an article which appeared a few years ago in the *American Magazine*: "A definite Christian faith is the one really important thing in life. I mean that literally. It is vastly more important than any profession; than any scientific research; than any other or all activities of a man's life. . . . My intimate experience has shown me that the Bible is a Living Word, just as definitely God's Word to me—and to every man who reads it—as a letter received in the morning's mail from my mother is her word to me. As such the Bible is its own defense and needs no apologist."

Sir Ambrose Fleming, professor of Electrical Engineering in the University of London, in his book *The Origin of Mankind* writes: "Although there are a considerable number of educated persons in the leading nations of mankind who regard the remarkable Hebrew and Jewish literature called the Bible merely as the production of the unassisted human intellect embodying myths, legends, and the imaginations of men in unscientific ages rather than as in any way a supernatural

revelation of truth, yet the fact remains that this literary masterpiece still retains, in spite of all attacks on it, a dominating position amongst human literature and is an encyclopedic work which in extent of production, sale, world-wide circulation, and perusal is unapproached by any other book or books ever written by mankind. It has a power of appeal to, and influence on, the learned and unlearned, powerful or simple, rich and poor, strong and feeble, civilized or uncivilized, possessed by no other set of books produced in the history of the world.

"It has had to fight battles for existence against the most violent attempts to exterminate it, the like of which has been endured by no other book. Yet today it has been translated into every language spoken on earth and printed and sold in numbers reckoned only in millions of copies. Whilst it is revered, loved, and treated by millions of those who have studied it as a supernatural book and in some way difficult to define, as a communication from the Creator of the Universe to Mankind, yet here again the greatest learning, cleverness, and ingenuity has been brought to bear upon it to undermine any belief of the above kind and represent it as the outcome of the human mind alone, having in it mistakes, inconsistencies, and fabrications, characteristic of imperfect human knowledge of events and facts.

"Side by side with these attempts to minimize its value and distort its meaning or deny the truth of its history, there has been of late years an enormous increase in the discovery of facts which confirm its historical accuracy by the work of much archaeological research and exploration."

W. Bell Dawson, "Gold Medalist in Geology and Natural Science at McGill University and Laureate of the Academy of Science at Paris," said: "To the present writer, the Bible is a revelation from God of those higher truths and of salvation through Christ. From a lifelong study of the Scriptures, he is also convinced that in every subject which they touch upon, their every word is reliable, deserves consideration; and this can only mean that they were written under divine supervision and guidance.

"If we will let the Bible speak for itself, we will be in a position to compare it with modern knowledge with some hope of enlightenment. We may thus find in the end that the portrayal of nature and of man as set before us in the Scriptures is not only corroborated by all that is most reliable in science but that by accepting what the Bible states, we will invariably be pointed to the right road and kept from the paths of error which would lead us astray in our advance in knowledge.

"Is it not, therefore, remarkable that the Bible instead of looking to science for its confirmation, in reality anticipates the highest and deepest that science can reach; and not only so, but brings these within the limits of our comprehension. Surely, these are marks of divine guidance and oversight; and they are reassuring to our belief that the Scriptures are a revelation from God."

Dr. Charles M. A. Stine, Director of Research for the Dupont Corporation, writing in the *Sunday School Times*, said:

"Christians are too often told that the Bible is unscientific, that it is outmoded, much of it clearly at variance with the teachings of

modern science. This is dinned into our ears by the vociferously articulate protagonists of so-called Modernism and accepted in grieved and doubtful silence by the wondering and groping heart of the devout. Let us examine briefly the alleged inerrancy and scope of modern science and a few of the concepts set forth in the Bible. We shall soon realize that science—man's wisdom—is a fluid and changing body of opinion as compared with the ineffable perfection of the wisdom of that Majesty who sits enthroned on high.

"There are many examples in the Bible that serve as incontrovertible evidence to the unprejudiced and thoughtful reader that the writers of the statements were divinely inspired. Many, many centuries before man's scientific discoveries had led to the apprehension of certain laws and truths, the Bible makes incidental reference to such truths."

When one reads these testimonies given by eminent representatives of science, one must marvel at the audacity of theologians who without special attainments in the sphere of so-called science nevertheless accuse the Scriptures of inaccurate statements in this sphere.

Digest of Luther's Brief Confession of the Holy Sacrament Against the Enthusiasts

(Dr. Martin Luthers kurzes Bekenntnis vom Heiligen Sakrament wider die Schwaermer. September, 1544. St. L. Ed., XX:1765—1790)

I: 1—17: Introduction

1. Luther expresses regret that Schwenkfeld slanders his letter of Nov. 8, 1543, and is inclined to place Schwenkfeld on the same level with all enthusiasts, Jews, Turks, Pope, and even the devil.—2. Having warned them often and earnestly, Luther decides to avoid the heretics according to the command of Tit. 3:10: "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject."—3. Schwenkfeld proves himself an irreconcilable enemy by his writings against Luther and his offense and laxity in regard to the holy Sacrament.

4. Fifteen years ago an attempt was made to come to an agreement in doctrine with Zwingli and Oecolampadius. They remained irreconcilable on the point of the Lord's Supper.—5. In the meantime these men were not brought closer to Luther, but were confirmed in their error. Zwingli was slain in battle, and Oecolampadius died soon afterwards; this caused Luther great grief.—6. After Zwingli's death a book appeared, supposedly written by Zwingli, which astonished Luther greatly and caused him to doubt whether Zwingli's soul was saved; for it was proof to him that he was dishonest—*Christianae Fidei Expositio*.—7—8. In this book Zwingli proves himself an enemy of the Holy Sacrament and actually becomes a heathen, for he includes in a list of so-called saints such heathen as Socrates, Aristides, Numa, etc., all professed heathen.—9—10. As a result Luther has lost all hope for an agreement between the followers of Zwingli and those who hold the truth. Luther would rather be torn or burned a hundred times than be considered

of the same mind with Schwenkfeld, Zwingli, Carlstadt, Oecolampadius, and the miserable enthusiasts.

11. They slander the Sacrament by conceiving of Christ's presence in a local sense, and call the Lutherans "*Fleischfresser*," "*Blutsaeufer*," "*Anthrophophagoi*," "*Capernaiten*," "*Thyesten*," and other names. — 12. Christ's body is not received part by part, but His entire body is offered in the Sacrament in an incomprehensible manner. — 13. They surely should know that they are telling a lie when they call the partakers of the true Sacrament by these names, since in the Mass they themselves have frequently sung and confessed the right view: "*Sumit unus, sumunt mille, quantum iste, tantum ille, nec sumptus absumitur*."

14—15. Moved by love the Lutherans went to Marburg, but were accused of a lack of it. The Zwinglians considered themselves as full of love; the Lutherans were charged with inconsideration and unmercifulness. What good did the Lutherans' attempt to meet the Zwinglians accomplish? Their insistence upon their heresy makes union impossible. They are to be avoided. Tit. 3:10. — 16. If it were true that only bread and wine are to be found in the Sacrament (which it certainly is not), there would still be no justification for the slanderers to hurl disparaging remarks at Lutherans. They are really blaspheming God's Word. — 17. Had Luther wished to retaliate, he could have called them soul murderers because of the soul-destroying work they are doing.

II: 18—42: The Opponents Pervert the Words of Institution

18. The enthusiasts are sinning to their eternal death. They have been warned and nevertheless continue to resist God's Word. — 19. They were warned first by the Holy Ghost, who showed them how they were divided by seven "spirits" in the interpretation of the Words of Institution.

20. Carlstadt said: "This is My body" should mean: "Here sits My body." — 21. A second "spirit," Zwingli, says it should be: "This represents My body." — 22. The third "spirit," Oecolampadius, says: "That is the sign of My body." — 23. The fourth, Schwenkfeld, declares that the meaning of the words: "This is My body" should be put aside and human reason should ascribe its own meaning to it, namely, thus: "Take and eat, My body which is given for you is this" (that is to say, a spiritual food). 24. The fifth "spirit" presents a somewhat similar argument: "Take, eat, that which is given for you is My body." — 25. The sixth one says: "Take, eat, this is the remembrance of My body." — 26. The seventh speaks thus: "The bread, which I give, is a body for itself, not My living natural body, but a dead and lifeless one, as wood or stone. But since the bread is My creature, it is My body." This view is perhaps the most offensive of all. — 27. Above all these "spirits" poses the devil as a "holy spirit" and says: This is no article of faith, believe what you will concerning it.

28. These false spirits, though they are in discord over the text, are agreed on what they consider a high, spiritual meaning, namely, that bread is bread and wine is wine. — 29. They make of the Lord's Supper an ordinary meal. According to that, any eating of bread or drinking of wine could be the Lord's Supper, for in a certain sense if we do all

things to the glory of God, that is a spiritual eating and drinking; that is, the equivalent of faith. — 30. They use two passages to support their contention: (1) John 6:63: "Flesh profiteth nothing," and (2) Eph. 4:10: "Ascended up far above all heavens."

31. Their argument based on the first passage, Luther has refuted so thoroughly that even Zwingli forgets about it in his last publication. — 32. The second argument — that the ascension to heaven hinders the true presence of Christ in the Sacrament — is due to a misconception of the ascension of Christ. If the ascension did not hinder the first Lord's Supper, it will not affect the succeeding celebration of the Sacrament.

33. At the *colloquium* at Marburg they tried to settle the issue by bringing about an agreement on the idea that the body of Christ is merely spiritually present. 1 Cor. 11:27, 29 refutes this false teaching, showing that even the unbeliever receives the true body of Christ. 34. They accuse the Lutherans of teaching a *local inclusion* of the body and blood of Christ in the bread and wine respectively. They well knew that neither Papists nor Lutherans have ever taught that. — 35. The Christian Church teaches that Christ's body is not *locally* in the Sacrament as straw in a sack, but *definitive*, that is, definitely; not as straw in a sack, yet actually, bodily.

36. When they left Marburg, Luther thought there was yet hope of gaining the others to the side of Scripture, but that seems hopeless now, due to the continued slander and opposition of the Zwinglian party. — 37. Their conscience must certainly tell them that they are wrong. Luther's conscience was clear because he had given them due warning.

38. In the third place they were warned by the judgment of God over Zwingli, who died in many sins and great blasphemy, as his last book shows. — 39. Zwingli did not die for a good cause, but in taking up the sword, he acted wickedly against those whom he attacked. — 40. His followers comfort themselves with the thought that they are spreading the Word of God, but what good can this accomplish when they pervert it. Many a heretic has been a diligent student of God's Word. — 41. They have had warnings of God, warnings from those who accept the words as they stand, and they are, in addition to this, self-warned, self-condemned. — 42. Here you have the reason why further discussions with them were cut off.

III: 43—61: The Seriousness of the Error of the Opponents

43. To summarize: They have in the first place taught that there is nothing but bread and wine in the Sacrament. We have shown them that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present. — 44. Luther succeeded in overthrowing the arguments they presented from the false exegesis of the two passages mentioned above. (John 6:63; Eph. 4:10.) — 45. Luther takes his stand with Abraham in believing that what God speaks He can also do. God's Word is more to be trusted than reason.

46. He who does not wish to subject his reason to the Word of God ought never to deal with the Word of God, for he will distort its meaning. — 47. Those who will not believe the article of the Lord's Supper, can they believe the article of the person of Christ? — 48. The heresy of

the enthusiasts has the earmarks of Eutychianism and Nestorianism. Let them consider how it is possible that the one and complete divine nature of the Son could so be separated that on the one hand it is united with the human nature, while the same one and only divine nature of the Father and the Holy Ghost is not united with the human nature, and then their enthusiasm and reasoning goes beyond all bounds. The devil cannot be idle when he has started only one heresy; he must invent more. When a ring breaks at one place, it is a ring no longer, and does not hold, but breaks again and again.

49. He who does not believe one doctrine will mutilate other doctrines as well. It is certain that one who does not rightly believe one article, or rejects it after he has been admonished and instructed, believes no article with earnestness and true faith. And whoever is so bold as to dare to deny God or accuse Him of falsehood in one statement, and does so deliberately and contemptuously in spite of one or two warnings or instructions, he will not only dare, but will in fact deny God and accuse Him of falsehood in all of His Word.—50. Therefore we have to say: Believe wholly, entirely, completely, or believe nothing. The Holy Ghost does not let Himself be turned or divided, so as to have one part regarded as true and to permit another part to be taught or believed as a false part of Scripture.

51. Arius is an example. He denied the deity of Christ and rejected the Author of his salvation.—52. Arius also rejected Baptism, forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake, and the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.—53. Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, rejected the article that the Holy Ghost is God, and he rejected many other things that Scripture teaches in regard to doctrine and Christian life.—54. Nestorius rejected the doctrine that God's Son was born of Mary. From this heresy and the two above-mentioned ones many other heresies grew, for example, Mohammedanism.—55. The Pope remains the most pernicious heretic, and his false doctrine of good works has led to terrible errors.—56. Likewise the enthusiasts are casting overboard the pure doctrine by denying the true meaning of the Words of Institution.

57. Enthusiasts try to clothe the devil with the bright garment of an angel of light when they speak of love and of a spiritual eating and drinking.—58. God would have His pure light shine forth in its full brilliance without any elements of darkness. Luke 11:35; Matt. 6:23; etc.—59. The heretics affirm that God is not strict if one article is not believed as long as all others are kept.—60. Such heretics make the mistake of conceiving of God's Word as man's word. The works they do are an abomination.—61. God does not delight in the sacrifice of fools, but demands obedience to His Word.

IV: 62—73: Regarding the Elevation of the Host

62. The abolition of the elevation of the host in Lutheran circles was looked upon by the enthusiasts as a concession that Christ is not actually present in the Sacrament, but it was really a protest against Roman Catholics, who made of the Lord's Supper a sacrifice, a work of man, rather than a reception of the grace of God through faith.—63. For

the sake of weak Christians Luther permitted the elevation to continue, explaining it not as a sacrifice, but as a means of encouraging the people to believe and to thank God for the grace He has given.—64. Elevation when thus retained was to be merely an admonition to believe.

65. Dr. Carlstadt pounced upon this procedure of Luther's and accused him of papistical tendencies. He should have known that Luther had warned against papistical error.—66. To maintain his Christian liberty, Luther thought it necessary to retain the elevation.—67. Since it is neither commanded nor forbidden, the elevation could be retained.—68. Enemies of the Sacrament can therefore not boast that the Lutherans complied with their will.—69. Yet in order to have unity in all churches, Luther suggests to follow the example of the majority and to eliminate the elevation.

70. A difference in ceremonies always carries with it the possibility of starting a schism.—71. The Roman Catholic Church has more differences than any other church on earth, yet the Pope permits this, as long as all agree to call him the Pope.—72. If you come to a community where the elevation is still in use, do not let it trouble your conscience. Perhaps it was impossible there to do away with this custom.—73. Let us strive for unity in such externals of worship, but at the same time let us not offend the weak.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

The Confessional Status of Prof. Otto A. Piper

The question has been submitted to the undersigned whether Professor O. A. Piper of Princeton Theological Seminary might not be classified among modern Lutheran theologians; at any rate, whether his doctrinal position is not rather (if not altogether) orthodox.

It might interest the reader to know a little of the well-known professor's life, whose frequent lectures among Lutherans have won him many friends in these circles. As *Religious Leaders of America* reports, Professor Piper has served Princeton Theological Seminary as instructor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis since 1937. He was born in Lichte, Germany, in 1891; attended the *Gymnasium* at Erfurt, Jena University, Marburg University, Paris University (securing his Th. D. in 1929), Munich University, and the University of Goettingen, where in 1920 he was made Licentiate of Theology. In 1920 he became *Privatdozent* at the University of Goettingen, and in 1930 professor of theology at the University of Muenster. He served as guest professor (Philosophy of Religion) in England from 1934 to 1937, after which he was called to Princeton. He is an industrious contributor to theological periodicals (*Theology Today*, *Crisis Theology*, etc.) and a busy writer of books, mostly of a non-controversial, practical character (*Die Grundlagen der evangelischen Ethik*, 2 vols., 1929—1930; *Recent Developments in German Protestantism*, 1934; *God in History*, 1939; *The Christian Teaching on Sex*, 1941).

Dr. Piper has been described by those who know him more intimately as a personally pious and very serious theologian. Since he was ordained as a minister in the Presbyterian Church, one might expect his theological position to be fundamentally Calvinistic. But the conservative

(Machen) group of Presbyterians does not recognize him as genuinely Reformed, and on this point both the Westminster Theological Seminary faculty (Orthodox Presbyterians) and the Faith Theological Seminary faculty (Bible Presbyterians) agree.

In *The Presbyterian Guardian* (Vol. 12, No. 4; Feb. 25, 1943) Dr. N. B. Stonehouse, professor of New Testament in Westminster Theological Seminary, points out that Dr. Piper is not an adherent of strict Calvinism, although "his theological point of view is *relatively* [italics in the original] conservative in the sense that he is far from being a left-wing radical, so far as modern thought is concerned." "Apparently," Dr. Stonehouse thinks, "he stands somewhat to the right of Karl Barth." In addition, the writer says: "There are emphases in the utterances of Dr. Piper that might well bring enthusiasm to ardent Fundamentalists. He seems to take the Bible seriously and often speaks of it as the Word of God. There is a strong Christo-centric emphasis in his approach, and the Christ whom he proclaims is no ordinary man: He is the incarnate Son of God in a unique sense, Virgin-born, worker of miracles, performing the redemption of man by His sacrifice on the Cross, raised from the grave, and coming again. He even closes his book *God in History* with the prayer: 'Even so, come, Lord Jesus.' Moreover, there seems to be an insistence, in opposition to the humanistic debasement of religion, that true religion has to do with the authority of divine revelation, the Lordship of Jesus, and the decisive significance of the work of the Holy Spirit" (p. 50).

Dr. Stonehouse then writes: "Sad to relate, however, these isolated propositions and emphases are set forth in a context and from a perspective which appear to share the fundamental presuppositions of Barthianism, which itself is not a return to Calvinism nor a return to any earlier conception of Christianity, not a return to the Bible, but an expression of Modernism. In speaking of Barthianism as Modernism I have in mind that, while it has repudiated various features of Liberalism and has sought to supply a corrective necessary to maintain the validity of religion, it actually shares the presuppositions of Liberalism to such an extent that it stands far closer to Liberalism than to orthodoxy."

The writer, in his article, examines Dr. Piper's viewpoints, in the main, on two points: Holy Scripture and Christ and Salvation. From *God in History* (p. 142) he quotes the following words explaining the Princeton professor's opinion on the Bible: "The truth of God is contained in the Bible; but Jesus showed that the Jews were mistaken when for this reason they identified the Bible with the Word of God. . . . God speaks to us whenever His Holy Spirit illumines the content of the Bible by the light of experience and holy history." This paragraph Dr. Stonehouse interprets (and we believe, correctly) as follows: "In other words, after all is said, not the Bible itself, as objective Scripture, is the Word of God, but God speaks only when the Holy Spirit takes of the things of the Bible and relates them to ourselves. This is nothing other than the Barthian doctrine that the Bible becomes the Word of God when God through it at any moment confronts us with Himself, but that it is not objectively, apart from our experience, the God-given

revelation. It is striking indeed that this view of Piper's, taught in 1943 at Princeton, is remarkably like that of Professor Briggs of Union Seminary, who was deposed from the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. fifty years ago because of his erroneous views of the Scriptures" (*Guardian*, p. 59). We ourselves have carefully read Dr. Piper's *God in History* and though he generally speaks in clearer and more orthodox terms than Barth does, the *principia cognoscendi* of both are fundamentally identical. In line with Barth's thought is also Piper's remark that "the only way of adequately coping with the problem raised by historical criticism (which both Barth and Piper acknowledge as justified) is the adoption of a dynamic, instead of the traditional static, conception of Holy Scripture" (*God in History*, p. 31; cf. also *Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, August, 1942, p. 10; *Presbyterian Guardian*, p. 59). Dr. Stonehouse remarks on this: "We are requested on this approach to give up the doctrine of our fathers that the Bible as a once-for-all God-given revelation, as it stands, must be accepted as authoritative and true on whatever topic it speaks, and to substitute the notion of a contemporaneous, momentary disclosure of the purpose of salvation in Christ." The writer next views Dr. Piper's fundamental meaning in the light of his remarks about the use of prooftexts. He says: "As a corollary of his Christo-centric principle, he maintains that individual texts may be appealed to as 'classical illustrations of a Biblical truth, but none of them,' he goes on to say, 'has argumentative force in itself. The prooftext method was the outcome of the above-criticized method that the Bible was primarily given for the purpose of teaching men wisdom'" (*Bulletin*, p. 11). After some further comment, Dr. Stonehouse proceeds: "His [Piper's] fundamental presupposition is that it is basically wrong to think of the Bible as authoritative on any subject other than the disclosure of God's saving purpose and hence that we may not properly assume that any particular passage, even if its meaning is grasped, is authoritative simply because it is found in the Bible" (*Guardian*, p. 59). What Dr. Stonehouse means by Piper's "Christo-centric principle" is that "that which the Bible is concerned with is the saving purpose of God in Christ, and nothing else" (*Bulletin*, p. 8), and that therefore where the Bible speaks on history, science, or philosophy, it is speaking outside its proper sphere and in so far is not authoritative (*Bulletin*, p. 8; *Guardian*, p. 59). The entire article by Professor Stonehouse is worth reading, since it brings many other quotations from Dr. Piper's writings showing that He is not orthodox according to the strict Calvinistic view of Scripture, but distinctively Barthian. We might say that Professor Piper rejects the *sola Scriptura* in the orthodox Lutheran sense, including the plenary inspiration, the infallibility, and the objective authority of the Bible.

Lack of space prevents us from presenting in full detail Dr. Stonehouse's remarks on the inadequacy of Professor Piper's views on Christ and salvation and sin. Dr. Piper indeed does not systematize his tenets, and his *God in History* is not a dogmatic; hence he does not express himself with sufficient clearness on these points so as to make his position fully lucid. But let the reader consider such a passage of

his as: "Their [the Jews'] rejection of Christ is based upon what they think is the revealed will of God. Hence their sin is not a breach of the Covenant which God made with them; and therefore it will not result in their annihilation" (*God in History*, p.95; *Guardian*, p.61). From this paragraph Dr. Stonehouse argues that "one can hardly escape the conclusion that he [Dr. Piper] does not regard faith in Christ as indispensable to salvation" (*Guardian*, p.60) and suggests that on this approach [if this were true] thousands of non-Christians could be saved (*Guardian*, p.61). He writes: "Dr. Piper's views lack the radical intolerance of the New Testament and share to a considerable extent the broad inclusivism of modern Christianity." (Cf. *God in History*, pp.117, 158, 165.) "This failure to accord Christ the full place which He is given in the Christian Gospel goes hand in hand," so Dr. Stonehouse next writes, "with an inadequate view of sin. Sin, to be sure, is not dealt with [by Dr. Piper] after the superficial manner of modern evolutionism. It is described as guilt, and the fall of man is affirmed. Yet, as we have noticed [*Guardian*, p.60], the Fall is not accepted as strictly historical; it is a fall 'from a spiritual world into this earthly world' (*God in History*, p.59). Moreover, no place is given, and no place can consistently be given, to the doctrine that all men share in an original corruption and total depravity as the result of the sin of Adam, the first man. . . . Since for Piper the Fall is not historical in the true sense, it does not possess a once-for-all character" (*Guardian*, p.61).

The Faith Seminary Presbyterian group (Bible Presbyterians) is in agreement with this verdict. In *The Sunday School Times* (September 18, 1943; cf. also the issues of September 25 and October 2), Professor R. L. Harris, instructor in Old Testament and Systematic Theology, Faith Theological Seminary, in a series of articles, entitled *More Barthian Books: A Brief Discussion of Some of the Teachings of Karl Barth as Found in Recent Books*, scores Barthianism, in the first place, for not believing that Scripture "is inerrant," but regarding it as a "human, fallible history through which men come in contact with God," quoting in proof of this Dr. Piper's statement: "The truth of God is contained in the Bible; but Jesus showed that the Jews were mistaken when for this reason they identified the Bible with the Word of God" (*God in History*, p.142). He then goes on to say: "He [Dr. Piper] accepts the higher criticism when he declares that Deuteronomy was not written by Moses, but 'by prophetic writers after his death' (*ibid.*, p.79) and again when, denying the unity of Isaiah, he refers to 'the exilic writer in the book of Isaiah' (*ibid.*, p.87). Further, he [Dr. Piper] denies the historicity of the early chapters of Genesis: 'Old Testament scholars have recognized for a long time that the narratives and genealogies given in the first chapters of Genesis are not on the same level as historical records. . . . In the first chapters of the Bible, human pre-history is narrated in mythical language'" (*ibid.*, pp.60,61). (Cf. *The Sunday School Times*, September 18, 1943, p.746 ff.) So also the Bible Presbyterians fail to regard Dr. Piper as a Calvinist in the traditional sense of the term.

Perhaps Dr. Piper's doctrinal position can best be explained from

his *prolegomena* in his *Vorwort* to his book *Die Grundlagen der evangelischen Ethik* (1. Band; Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann in Guetersloh, 1928), in which he states the principle of his theological approach, not indeed as fully as one would desire, but nevertheless clearly enough to show his fundamental theological premise. Here he states, among other things, that "nothing would delight him more than the abrogation of the confessional antitheses within Protestantism (*Die Aufhebung des konfessionellen Gegensatzes innerhalb des Protestantismus*, p. XXIII). "Despite all his efforts to co-operate in this endeavor, he, nevertheless, could not deny the Lutheran orientation of his position (*blieb ihm gleichwohl die lutherische Grundhaltung seiner Stellung nicht verborgen*; *ibid.*). According to this statement, Dr. Piper, though being inclined toward Lutheranism, would gladly aid in the unionizing effort of abolishing within Protestantism the divisive trends of Lutheranism and Calvinism, not, however, in such a way that error would be corrected by heeding and obeying Scripture, but by a new confessionalism, based on the experience of truth (*Wirklichkeitsgefuehl*) (*ibid.*). But what, then, is truth? Dr. Piper regards his own doctrinal position as closely related to that of Lutheran confessionalism, represented in the middle of the past century by such men as G. Harless, Th. Harnack, R. Seeberg, and later, by men like Carl Stange and Karl Holl (p. XIII). This does not mean that he is willing to yield the achievements of critical theology (*die Errungenschaften der kritischen Theologie irgendwie preiszugeben*; p. XXII). Also on this point he deeply appreciates Barth and is eager to show his deep reverence for him as a great theologian (p. XXI). But his approach to the theological problem is not directly that of Barthian dialecticalism, but rather that of the new experience of truth (*Wirklichkeitsgefuehl*) or of the Neo-Realism which Barthian Theology originated (*ibid.*). He rejects as a misnomer the term Neo-Orthodoxy (*ibid.*), for he does not want any orthodoxy which once for all holds to the traditional truth as permanently established (*Wirklichkeitsbild*). Theology is fluid and so must have recourse to speculation (*die Theologie wird staerker als andere Wissenschaften ihre Zuflucht zur Spekulation nehmen muessen*; p. XIX); it must be "mythical" in the right sense of the term (*ibid.*). Dr. Piper deprecates the traditional method of "convicting opponents of heresy by means of quoting Scripture passages, passages from the Fathers or excerpts from Luther." This seems to him a method by means of which almost anything can be proved. His theology (he says) is indeed evangelical, that is to say, it is a theology intended for the evangelical Church. A theology, however, is heterodox only if either it fails to see essential parts of the ecclesiastical conviction (*kirchliche Glaubenswirklichkeit*) altogether, or if it sees them in a wrong light (p. XVII).

All these statements show how very close Dr. Piper is to Barth in his theological methodology. He declares indeed: "The aim of theology is pure doctrine, orthodoxy" (*das Ziel der Theologie ist die reine Lehre, Orthodorie*; p. XVIII), but he at once defines theology as the attempt to obtain pure doctrine by way of science (*Theologie ist der Versuch, die reine Lehre auf dem Wege der Wissenschaft zu gewinnen*; *ibid.*). It is from this viewpoint that one can well understand his remark that

his approach is neither historical, nor Biblicistic, or confessional (*weder historisch noch biblizistisch oder konfessionalistisch*; p. XVI). His principle by which truth must be determined is that of Neo-Realism (*das neue Wirklichkeitsgefuehl*; p. XIII), by which evangelical truth, accepted *a priori* in its fundamental tenets, is speculatively developed and demonstrated. This Neo-Realism is the special merit of Karl Barth (*der unerhoerte Erfolg der Barthschen Theologie liegt darin begruendet, dass hier zum ersten Male einem neuen Wirklichkeitsgefuehl Ausdruck verliehen wurde*; p. III).

Dr. Piper's connection with Barth therefore cannot be denied. As Barth's theology is "scientific theology," so called, so also is Dr. Piper's. Neither Barth nor Piper accepts Holy Scripture as the only infallible source and norm of faith and life. Evangelical truth is *a priori* accepted as the "realistic conviction" of the Church and is then further expounded and demonstrated by speculative thought. But evangelical truth is thus removed from its divine, inerrant foundation; and since it is not anchored in the divinely inspired Scripture, which in its every statement comes to man with the divine declaration: "Thus saith the Lord," and since the "Word of God," according to Barthian interpretation, is whatever truth God might instill into the particular person who uses the Bible in an altogether subjective way, there is absolutely no guarantee that objective Christian truth, in its traditional sense, can be possessed or maintained within the Church. If Dr. Piper errs in the doctrines of Christ, salvation, sin, and so forth (as he is charged), it is because he rejects the *sola Scriptura*, the divine, inerrant foundation and source of the Christian doctrine. Speculation in theology only deceives and misleads. Scientific theology can only abolish divine truth, not establish divine truth. The theologian who rejects the Bible as God's Word in its objective sense will soon find himself utterly without the divine Word. Dr. Piper's theological methodology is indeed modern, and that in the sense not only of Barth, but also of Schleiermacher. There may be a difference in degree, but not in kind. All three draw their theology, not from Scripture, but from reason. We do not say too much if we declare that Dr. Piper's theological approach is Modernistic in essence and so bound to lead ultimately to a complete denial of all Scriptural truth. If it does not do so, it is only by a "fortunate inconsistency" that must be ascribed to the preserving grace of God. In reviewing, in the *Crisis Theology Quarterly* (Vol. 2, No. 1; Fall, 1944), Dr. A. M. Hunter's *The Unity of the New Testament* Professor Piper favorably notes Dr. Dodd's remark "that the greatest mistake in reading the Bible is the belief that the Bible offers doctrines to which we should give assent" (p. 50). Barth's speculative, Bible-rejecting "scientific theology" certainly could not have been stated more clearly by himself than it is put in these words. He who speaks after this fashion does not accept Scripture as the Word of God and should not complain if he is suspected of going the way of the Modernist. At any rate, such "scientific theology" is not the believing Scripture theology of Luther and the Lutheran Confessions; and no one can blame the champions of traditional orthodoxy if warningly they declare: "Here is Liberalism in a new disguise."

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

How is Truth Determined?

Using as caption "Science and the Supernatural," Mr. George Johnson, in the *Presbyterian* of November 9, 1944, submits some helpful observations on the attacks made on our Christian beliefs by people who claim to be devotees of science. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Johnson, examining the position taken by Prof. A. J. Carlson, who in 1944 was President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, writes as follows: "Omitting the details, let us accept for the moment Professor Carlson's main thesis, which, you may recall, is that nothing is to be taken for true unless it can be verified by controlled observation or experiment. About the time of the lecture [of Professor Carlson], over a decade ago [first published in 1931 in *Science*] this was a fundamental tenet of that school of thinking that is variously called Neo-positivism, logical empiricism, or the Unity of Science. But it was soon pointed out that if direct observation were required for truth, all the past would have to be excluded, for it is impossible to directly observe the past. Universal propositions must also go, since it is obviously impossible to directly observe a numberless series of facts. Single statements must also be given up, since each involves an indefinite repetition of observation. For this reason the assumption on which Professor Carlson builds has been rejected as inadequate by the very school to which he consciously or unconsciously adheres. But the same school also disagrees with Professor Carlson in his abandonment of religious statements. It could not well be otherwise in view of the universality of religion and the impressive part it has played as a factor in human evolution. Any philosophy that had made a synoptic view of all the data of experience could not politely bow out of the domain of its system such an important factor in man's history and progress, and therefore a place has been found for religious beliefs within the Unity of Science." It strikes us that these are observations which a person may well bear in mind when unbelievers launch their attacks against our Christian faith.

A.

Theological Observer

A Book Review and Its Effects.—In the October *Lutheran Outlook* a review of *Toward Lutheran Union*, by Graebner-Kretzmann, appeared over the signature of Emmer Engberg, from which we quote the following:

"In the first place, we find on page 2 this statement: 'According to Scripture this unity presupposes one thing, a feature which is *absolutely essential* to the establishment and maintenance of a God-pleasing oneness of spirit, and that is the *full agreement* (italics mine) as to the inspiration, the infallibility, and the inviolability of the Holy Scriptures. As we shall see, we are compelled by Holy Writ itself to make this a *conditio sine qua non* in all negotiations tending toward church fellowship of every kind and degree.'

"To some this insistence may seem harmless. Indeed it may appear legitimate. But the authors surely know that 'full agreement' by human beings, especially in the realms which they have indicated, one of which by their own admission involves a mysterious process (page 11), is impossible. . . .

"But this insistence takes on terrifying proportions when the writers insist on not only 'full agreement' on the inspiration, infallibility, and inviolability of Scriptures but 'full agreement' on a particular theory of inspiration, viz., verbal inspiration. One would think that such an extreme view, such an extraconfessional demand, would be open for debate; but no, it is a closed question. It is set before the Church as a demand, fully prefabricated. It has the finality of a doctor's prescription. All the 'patient' has to do is to 'take it.'

"But we must not brush aside Missouri's 'insistence on an agreement on the basis of Scripture . . . with a haughty "You can't make me sign on the dotted line!"' To so act would not only go contrary to the author's hope (page 239), it would be in bad taste. On the other hand, we must, some of us at least, reply to this insistence with a plain, firm 'We cannot sign!' And we cannot sign simply because we cannot honestly make the *theory* of verbal inspiration a *dogma*, as they do. And it follows that we cannot, as they can (page 10), make an acceptance of a different theory, no matter how much we may disagree with it, by 'leading theologians in certain sections of the Lutheran Church in America,' tantamount to an attack on the fact of inspiration itself. . . .

"The simple fact seems to be that 'Union Now' with Missouri is utterly out of the question. We are foundationally 'miles apart.' Missouri believes in the dogma of verbal inspiration. We do not! And until we can have 'agreement' on this question, any further talk of union is both unnecessary and nonsense."

This review called forth sharp protests not only from one of the authors of the book, Dr. P. E. Kretzmann, but we are happy to see, from a number of members of the American Lutheran Conference, whose letters were published in the November issue of the *Lutheran Outlook*.

Pastor E. Denef, Theresa, Wis., writes: "I am very sorry that this

denial of verbal inspiration comes from a pastor of our church body. Did he not know that the American Lutheran Church confesses verbal inspiration of the Scriptures?"

From the far West, P.F.H. Theuer, Salem, Oreg., voices his dissatisfaction with the position taken by the reviewer:

"I find it necessary to voice my thorough dissent and protest to the implications contained in the review of the book *Toward Lutheran Union*, by Emmer Engberg in the October issue of the *Outlook*. Especially so when he seems to imply that all other Lutherans outside of Missouri stand with him in his vehement opposition to the Biblical doctrine of verbal inspiration of the Scriptures. He apparently is totally ignorant of the fact that at least one other large Lutheran synod, and that a member of the American Lutheran Conference, is in complete agreement with Missouri on this *Lutheran* doctrine, viz., the American Lutheran Church. . . . When, therefore, Pastor Engberg says in conclusion to his review: 'Missouri believes in the dogma of verbal inspiration. We do not!' then there are those of us, myself definitely included, who must protest against this all-inclusive 'we,' for we do believe it as a fundamental doctrine of God's Holy Word and therefore basic to all other Scriptural teachings, and we shall stand by this Biblical doctrine with all our heart's faith and strength. And then it is a sad fact that 'we are foundationally "miles apart"' even within the American Lutheran Conference."

Dr. P. Buehring of the Ev. Lutheran Theological Seminary expresses himself in this manner:

"Since the *Lutheran Outlook*, according to its masthead, is the 'Official Organ of the American Lutheran Conference,' I as a member of that Conference must register my dissent from the views expressed by Emmer Engberg in his review of the book *Toward Lutheran Union* in the October issue of the *Outlook*, more particularly the categorical statement in his last paragraph, 'Missouri believes in the dogma of verbal inspiration. *We do not!*' (Italics mine.) . . . If the reviewer thinks he is speaking for 'most of non-Missouri Lutheranism' in America when he says so categorically, 'We do not!' he is badly mistaken. On the contrary, the doctrine (not 'theory') of verbal inspiration is today the official dogma of the vast majority of Lutherans in America. The American Lutheran Church confesses it in its constitution, as well as in its *Declaration* of 1938 and in the Pittsburgh Agreement, which it ratified in 1940. The United Lutheran Church in America ratified this Agreement in the same year, hence it is only fair to assume that this doctrine is officially held by that church body. When the American Lutheran Conference was organized in 1930, there was full agreement among the representatives of the five participating church bodies on this important question; certainly the commissioners of the American Lutheran Church heard of no disagreement, or they would never have voted in favor of the organization. . . . Clearly, then, the burden of proof rests upon those who at this time want us to depart from the well-established historic position of American Lutheranism. If the reviewer of *Toward Lutheran Union* is one of these, let him present his arguments; but let him not assume that he is speaking for any appreciable

number of Lutherans in America when he declares so emphatically, 'We do not!' And let not the readers of the *Lutheran Outlook* mistake the opinion of one man for the official position of the American Lutheran Conference."

Another voice from the West, P. Mikkell Lono, Parkland, Wash.:

"I was startled by this statement: 'Missouri believes in the dogma of verbal inspiration. We do not!' . . . The undersigned holds no brief for Missouri. He finds it difficult for several reasons to feel at one with them, and especially does he find it difficult to consider of small importance their heresy concerning prayer fellowship. But he agrees with Missouri that there can be no Lutheran unity except on the basis of the doctrine of verbal inspiration. . . . If we should be compelled to conclude from the review in question that any group within the Lutheran Church believes that God the Holy Spirit has not inspired the words of our Bible, and that therefore they are not God's words we read there, then it is not only a question of unity with Missouri. There would then be no unity within the rest of Lutheranism in America, and the sooner we quit pretending the better. God grant that this is not so." T. L.

The Lutheran Hour a Mighty Missionary Force.—It is an amazing story of growth and progress which "Bringing Christ to the Nations" (a bulletin whose secondary title is "The Lutheran Hour News") tells its readers. One is impressed especially with the reports pertaining to South America and Central America. The Lutheran Hour, as letters evidence, has been listened to in Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Paraguay, Peru, Colombia, Brazil, Venezuela, Ecuador, British and Dutch Guiana, and in Nicaragua, Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala. Among the West Indies, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Dominican Republic are represented in this bulletin. Correspondence from Mexico shows that that country has been penetrated, although no station in its borders is permitted to broadcast the Lutheran Hour. The work in the countries south of us is done in Spanish, Portuguese, and English. The progress of the Lutheran Hour is all the more remarkable when one considers that in our country the time for broadcasting has been restricted and only half an hour is granted on the Mutual network and, at that, not at a very favorable time, 11:30 A. M. Sunday mornings (CST). When in addition to this we consider that no appeal for funds is any longer permissible, the forward march of the station is something which one may well describe as extraordinary. May God continue to bless this grand effort for the spreading of the Gospel both in our land and abroad. A.

Lutheran Statistics.—The *National Lutheran Council News Bulletin* submits a compilation of figures in which the statistics of 1942 pertaining to all Lutheran general bodies in the United States and Canada are compared with those of 1943. We reprint here some of the main items.

The number of confirmed members increased from 3,635,588, to 3,713,102 (2.13%); the number of baptized members increased from 5,116,807 to 5,277,128 (3.13%); the number of ministers increased from 13,332 to 13,593 (1.95%); the number of congregations increased from 16,955 to 17,139 (1.07%). The size of "average" congregation increased from 302 to 308 (2%). The number of schools (Sunday schools, parochial

schools, vacation and weekday Bible schools) decreased from 25,473 to 23,035 (9.5%). The number of pupils under instruction increased from 1,856,315 to 1,871,804 (.8%). Regretting that the number of schools experienced such a sharp decrease, we are happy to see, on the other hand, that the number of pupils under instruction showed an increase, even though only a slight one. A.

"Conservative and Confessional, but Not in the Ultra Sense of the Synodical Conference."—This is the description which a reporter uses with respect to the American Lutheran Conference. His article treats of the biennial convention of the American Lutheran Conference which was held in Milwaukee, Wis., Nov. 15—17, 1944, and was published in the *Lutheran Standard* for Dec. 16. Whether the words quoted are of his own coinage or whether they are taken from a paper presented by Dr. L. M. Stavig, secretary of the Conference, is not evident—the report is characterized more by enthusiasm than by clarity—but the words in question have the reporter's approval without a doubt.

Concerning the United Lutheran Church we find that it is criticized somewhat in a statement which speaks of the American Lutheran Conference as "maintaining a virile freedom, but avoiding the extremes of the United Lutheran Church in America." A Synodical Conference member would like to know what is included in the phrase "the ultra sense of the Synodical Conference." What are the reporter and his brethren objecting to? Is it this, that the Synodical Conference insists on purity of doctrine and always maintains that you cannot be for and against a certain principle at the same time? Is it the Synodical Conference's teaching that the Bible is inerrant and its refusal to establish church fellowship with those who will not grant such perfection to our sacred volume? Is it the Synodical Conference's insistence that everything that the Bible teaches is divine and must be binding for us? If this is what the reporter has in mind when he speaks of the "ultra sense of the Synodical Conference," we admit that we stand for the things mentioned. But is this something to be ashamed of? Is not this the position of Luther and the Lutheran confessions? If fellowship can be established only through the shattering of the foundations mentioned, then we shall rather forego the pleasures and advantages which fellowship would offer and continue to travel our way alone.

Since we are here speaking of the American Lutheran Conference, we wish to add that the officers elected for the next biennium are Dr. H. L. Yochum of Detroit, Mich., president, and three vice-presidents: the Rev. Carl J. Wilhelmsen of Racine, Wis., the Rev. John A. Houkom of Ashland, Wis., and Dr. Oscar A. Benson of Chicago, Ill.; Dr. L. M. Stavig of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., secretary; and Mr. Otto Leonardson of Minneapolis, treasurer. Its work for the Lutheran students at the various universities was turned over to the National Lutheran Council.

A resolution was adopted which recommends "that its executive committee together with its Commission on Christian Higher Education explore all the possibilities for the establishment of a Lutheran university in America, including a postgraduate school of theology."

The Overture for Lutheran Unity which was published by a committee of the Conference in the *Lutheran Outlook* about a year ago, and which we at the time declared inadequate, was adopted. A.

How Chaplains View the Work That Should be Done by the Church at Home.—“A group of Presbyterian chaplains serving with the New Zealand forces in Italy recently held a conference in Rome and discussed the problem of rehabilitation as it affects the churches. They forwarded a list of suggestions to the Church at home which include recommendations that there be more simple, practical, and positive teaching of the fundamentals of our Christian faith; active support of the ecumenical movement in a practical way; cultivation of a deeper fellowship, in individual churches, and to this end the formation of men's fellowships or clubs; care of wives and sweethearts now; more frequent observation of Holy Communion, since many men on active service have come to value weekly Communion services; training for Christian citizenship in the forefront of youth work; establishment of churches in new housing areas where many of the returned men will settle; and a form of reception into communicant membership of the church such that men will feel they are joining a church which demands the highest and best of them.” Apart from the indifference with respect to doctrine, which to some extent is reflected here, this paragraph printed in the *Christian Century* of Dec. 13, should be heeded. A.

The Biennial Session of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America was held from Nov. 28 to 30, 1944, in the William Penn Hotel, Pittsburgh, Pa. On behalf of the *Christian Beacon* the Rev. Carl McIntire attended the meetings, and it is from his report in this paper that we take the following items. In place of Bishop Henry St. George Tucker the Federal Council elected as president Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of the M. E. Church (Boston Area), who, by the way, is a 32d degree Mason and, as Rev. C. McIntire declares, “an outstanding Modernist and a well-known pacifist.” The new vice-president is Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, president of Morehouse College, Atlanta, Ga., the first Negro ever to be chosen for an office in the Federal Council. The Federal Council is the official spokesman for 25 Protestant denominations and claims to speak for 25,000,000 Protestants. The organization and operation of the Council was handled most smoothly by Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary. The Federal Council, as usually, concerned itself with many questions not directly concerning it as a church federation. But one business pertaining to its very existence was given considerable attention, namely, the applications for membership in the Council by the following five church bodies: the Russian Orthodox Church of North America, the Universalist Church of America, the General Convention of the New Jerusalem (Swedenborgians), the Church of the East and of the Assyrians, and the Czech-Moravian Brethren. The three last were rather quickly disposed of; for since they are relatively small groups, they were referred to the executive committee to consider what should be done with smaller groups, the executive committee having power to act. The application of the Universalist Church of America gave the Federal Council no little trouble.

Dr. Cavert said that there has been considerable uncertainty in the minds of the members of the executive committee as to the position of the Universalist Church today and that it was the unanimous conviction of the executive committee that the Federal Council should maintain an evangelical position in keeping with the preamble of the constitution, which speaks of Jesus Christ as "divine Lord and Savior." He also declared that the application of the Church appeared to be evangelical, but that the doctrinal information concerning it in the federal census looked "in a somewhat different direction." Many representatives spoke in favor of receiving the Universalists, but many also were negative. Finally it was resolved that the vote to be taken should be one of expediency and not one of principle. Three reasons were given for the expediency vote to keep out the Universalists: first, the threat of certain groups to leave the Federal Council; second, the rising influence and organization of the Fundamentalists; third, the unsettled conditions in the world and the need of the Federal Council to "keep its own boat from rocking." The Russian Orthodox Church was finally received as a body which is evangelical, though its anti-Protestant tenets were well-known to the Federal Council (the Mass, transubstantiation, Mariolatry, intercession of saints, prayers for the dead, etc.). Only the United Presbyterian Church voted unanimously against receiving the Russian Orthodox Church, though the Church is a sister to the Eastern Orthodox Churches which are already in the Federal Council. An editorial in the *Christian Beacon* (Dec. 7, 1944, p. 4) says: "The Federal Council cannot possibly call itself a Protestant organization any more. It cannot possibly claim to be evangelical." Another editorial, entitled "Tragedy of Federal Council," appears on the same page. The editorial says (quoted in part): "There were certain things that were emphasized and stood out in the three-day meeting of the Federal Council in Pittsburgh. First, a recognition and a realization of the awful condition that exists in the world and the Church. This fact was impressed repeatedly upon all present in many different ways. Second, an open confession of the tremendous drive being made by the Roman Catholic Church, the effectiveness of its program, the power that it is having upon Government. Speaker after speaker referred to this. Third, a tremendous emphasis upon the taking of the story and the issues of the Federal Council down to the people. The ecumenical movement, it was repeatedly said, does not exist until it exists at the crossroads and in middle-town. The great tragedy comes in its remedy. The remedy, according to the Federal Council, is the ecumenical movement, unity. But what is this unity? It is a unity that in one voice says, 'We must maintain the evangelical position,' and in another voice, 'We must take in the Russian Orthodox Church,' which teaches that salvation is by faith plus works. It is a unity which declares, 'We will not receive the Universalist Church, but many of us are universalists in our beliefs.' It is a unity which must base its actions upon a least common denominator of all blends of views. This is the tragedy. . . . The remedy for the perilous conditions in which we are finding ourselves is not the ecumenical movement. It is the blessing and favor of God upon the simple message of individual, personal regeneration by faith in the

shed blood of Jesus Christ. Much talk about 'the Christian faith,' much talk about serving Jesus Christ, was heard; but it means little in the presence of such gross denials of the truth of God's infallible Word."

J. T. M.

Progressive Education at Columbia University. — *The Calvin Forum* (August-September, 1944) comments very earnestly on the remarks of Columnist Paul Mallon, whose articles appear in papers and magazines with a certified circulation of at least 12,000,000, on the "progressive education theories" of the National Progressive Education Association at the Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. Mr. Mallon, among other things, said: "There was spawned and propagated the theory that a child should be given full, uninhibited expression of his impulses, and there the whole story of education was geared to this free expression."

The Calvin Forum, in describing this theory, writes: "Practically this system of education calls for the removal of all restraints. Don't insist on hard work. Don't be stern in discipline. Better yet, have no discipline at all. Don't guide and direct the child's educational tendencies. Discover them and make it easy for him to grow without any hindrances. Let there be freedom. Trust nature to take the child upward and onward toward the state of 'culturedness.' To flunk him means to give him an inferiority complex. To make him work is to stunt his growth. To discipline him is to make him shy or, what is worse, rebellious. How strikingly in contrast all this is with the educational injunctions which sparkle like so many gems throughout the Scriptures!" In conclusion the *Forum* writes: "What have been the obvious fruits of such a program of education? Juvenile difficulties have increased at an alarming rate. The deficiency in scholarship, as revealed by the Army and Navy tests, is shocking. That should have a sobering effect upon the progressive-education enthusiasts. Adult delinquency is, perhaps, a fruit of this kind of education that is too easily overlooked. The disintegrating forces can be seen in the field of business, where men are not too much concerned about 'black markets' and other illegal transfers of commodities; in the realm of politics, where we condone without protest the reprehensible conduct of our representatives and take the breaking of their promises as a matter of course; and in the kingdom of social living, where there is no righteous indignation against cheapness, sloth, dishonesty, and immorality. That is the temper of our age, and this temper is the product of the educational forces that have been molding this generation."

No wonder that just now conservative forces in Calvinistic circles are planning a Christian university at Philadelphia, where the fundamentals of Christianity are to be applied to every sphere of education. *The Lutheran Companion* (Nov. 8, 1944), in an excellent editorial, has taken notice of the progressive-education movement and reports that Dr. Butler, in an address at the opening of Columbia's 191st academic year, has so inveighed against the Progressive Education Association that, embarrassed by a storm of criticism coming from all parts of the country, it felt constrained to change its name to the American Education Fellow-

ship, without, however, giving up its theory; for in a proclamation it branded as "enemies of good education" all those who are "crying mightily for discipline, facts, and skills, the three R's, emphasis on the learning of the past." The *Companion* expresses the hope that "the Fellowship will undoubtedly find Dr. Butler an antagonist who must be reckoned with."

J. T. M.

Reorganization of "German Evangelical" Church Considered.—The *Religious News Service* informs its patrons that German Evangelical Church leaders "have drafted far-reaching plans for active co-operation with religious bodies in other countries for participation of churches in the re-education of the German people." There is something mysterious about this information. How German leaders could meet and draw up plans whose execution presupposes the overthrow of the Nazis, it is hard to explain. According to the information given, the leaders think of creating the office of archbishop for the whole Protestant Church in Germany. Under him there will be six bureaus, one of which will handle foreign affairs. One objective of the whole undertaking will be to make the German people more church-minded and to regain the youth for the work of the Church. Our readers are warned not to put too much credence in reports of this nature.

A.

The Power of the Roman Press Examined.—Whoever is unwilling to believe that the Roman Catholic hierarchy wields strong influence in our country and asserts itself in the political and other nonreligious fields had better read the article by Harold E. Fey, field editor of the *Christian Century*, which, under the heading "Catholicism and the Press," appeared in the Dec. 13 issue of that journal. These are the opening paragraphs of the article:

"Most newspapers maintain a strict silence on questions which might adversely affect their relations with the Roman Catholic Church. This is so common an occurrence that when a newspaper breaks the unwritten rule, *Time* considers it news. Such an incident was reported in its issue of October 23, 1944. A few weeks previously the *San Francisco News* printed a news item saying that a Roman Catholic priest with a woman companion had pleaded guilty in a Madera, Calif., court to drunken driving. In spite of two attempts by the office of Archbishop John J. Mitty to get the *News* to kill the story, it appeared, as did a later report that the priest had paid a fine of \$250. The result was an organized boycott by the Roman Catholic Church against the paper which had dared to print the item. Archbishop Mitty took the lead in this attempt to discipline what he called a 'bigoted' and 'antagonistic' paper.

"This incident is typical. It reveals clearly that the Catholic Church values a subservient press far more than it prizes the freedom of the fourth estate. Archbishop Mitty stands at the very center of Catholic life in America. He is a member of the board of ten archbishops and bishops who administer the affairs of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the national organization through which the American hierarchy works to win this nation to the Roman Catholic faith. In acting as he did to punish the San Francisco newspaper, Archbishop

Mitty served notice, if notice were needed, that journalistic freedom will go the way it has gone in all Catholic nations if the hierarchy wins dominance in America.

"Only a few newspaper editors have the courage of the editor of the *San Francisco News*. The majority mistakenly believe that if they handle the Roman Catholic Church with gloves they can win its favor. They seem totally oblivious of the fact that the hierarchy is steadily undermining their position in American life by the development of its own press. Catholics are persistently taught that only in the Catholic press can they read the truth. Yet most newspapers do what all the papers of San Francisco but one did in the case reported by *Time*. Thus they leave to Protestant papers a whole sector in the defense of freedom of the press even though their own future is also involved."

In the body of his article Mr. Fey submits much pertinent information. "The 1942 edition of the *Catholic Press Directory* lists 332 church publications with a total circulation of 8,925,665." "The backbone of the Catholic press is the diocesan weekly. Many of these weeklies are standard eight-column newspapers in size. They are usually edited by competent journalists and accurately reflect the attitude of the bishop of the diocese." "Several devices are used by the hierarchy to develop and extend its national press. . . . By all standards the most effective agency has been the press department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which has now been in existence for more than two decades. . . . From the beginning it has been staffed by the most competent available Catholic journalists, men and women, many of whom have had experience on some of the greatest newspapers in the country. . . . By radio, telegraph, long-distance telephone, and air mail it collects news from all parts of the planet. In its spacious offices in Washington this news is translated, evaluated, and put into good newspaper form as efficiently and intelligently as it would be in the office of any of the major news-gathering agencies. There is only one difference, but that is too important to be overlooked. Every event and idea is treated from the angle which best serves the interest of the Roman Catholic Church." "There is nothing surprising in the fact that this workmanlike approach to building a Catholic press is increasingly successful. The Catholic press is being fed, and it is growing. The hierarchy has provided this nurture through the National Catholic Welfare Conference. This press office also serves Catholicism abroad. . . . When one reads in a paper from south of the border an article demanding the recall of Protestant missionaries, it is wise to inquire whether the article was written in Washington." "Another device through which the American hierarchy is attempting to strengthen the Catholic press is the Catholic Press Association. This conference body annually brings hundreds of editors and publishers together. They combine to obtain general advertising for their papers, to reduce costs of publication through cooperative ventures, and to encourage Catholic writers. More than a hundred publication houses are linked in this organization."

Mr. Fey lists several Roman Catholic papers which are not under the direct control of the hierarchy: *America* (Jesuit weekly), *Commonweal* (a weekly published by a group of laymen), *Catholic World*

(a Paulist publication), *Interracial Review* (a monthly in the field of race relations). To show what the Catholic press can do, the article points to the campaign against immoral motion pictures, which, at least for a time, was quite successful. Here, of course, there was an issue in which Protestant religious papers made common cause with the Roman Catholic press.

We submit the above material to bring proof that whatever the position of Roman Catholicism may be in Europe, in the United States its power is very formidable. A.

Brief Items. — A Protestant Episcopal synodical convention in British Columbia passed this resolution: "Be it resolved that this provincial synod urges that positive action be taken through the proper authorities to insure that, should a permanent chaplaincy be maintained after the war, it can be arranged in the three departments, Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Protestant; or that in some other way the rights of all Anglican members of the forces to receive the ministrations of their own Church, at the hands of the Anglican chaplains, be carefully safeguarded." A strong anti-unionistic blast.

Pearl Buck in Chicago said on the Chinese: "The Chinese are not primarily a religious people, just as we are not. The great opportunity for Christian missions, therefore, is to send missionaries who can co-operate with Chinese leaders. This means the sending of a new type of missionary. A Christian strategy based on dogmatic divisions will not do. The Western practicality which has spent itself so largely in reducing Eastern mysticism to hard mechanical dogmas might equally well be directed to co-operative socio-religious endeavor. Then it would meet the Chinese mind on common ground." In other words, preach the Gospel without the doctrine of Christ at the center.

A United Association of Evangelical Christians and Baptists has been formed in the U.S.S.R., according to the information bulletin of the Soviet embassy in Washington. The action was taken at a recent conference attended by delegates from Moscow, Leningrad, the Caucasus, Siberia, the Ukraine, Byelorussia, the Volga Valley, the Crimea, and Kazakhstan. — *Christian Century*.

Great Britain again has an archbishop of Canterbury: Dr. Geoffrey Francis Fisher, Lord Bishop of London, has been appointed to succeed the late Dr. Temple as incumbent of the highest office in the Anglican Church. The new archbishop is 57 years old and, what is surprising, held an ecclesiastical position not earlier than 1932, when he was made bishop of Chester. Prior to that he served in the educational field; he was headmaster of Repton School from 1914 to 1932. His appointment to the see of London took place in 1939. The public press states that, as far as the ecumenical movement is concerned, he agrees with the views of his predecessor.

The Church of Scotland has lost a scholarly missionary in the death of James Hair Maclean, who had studied at Glasgow, Oxford, and Jena, and for almost fifty years served as missionary in South India (Bangalore). A.

Book Review

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo.

The Christian Sacraments. Hugh Thomson Kerr. The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Pa. 179 pages, 5½×8¼. \$2.00.

To the theologian interested in Christian doctrine of the conservative type, it causes sincere joy to review this new monograph on the Sacraments, for it means that there is again sufficient interest in positive theology to warrant the publication of such a treatise. In other words, there is a swing back to the study of historical theology. Dr. Kerr has for thirty-one years served as pastor at the Shadyside Presbyterian Church in Pittsburgh, and has two sons in the ministry, one of whom, Dr. H. T. Kerr, Jr., is professor at Princeton Theological Seminary and recent author of two widely read books, *A Compend of Luther's Theology* and *A Compend of the Institutes of the Christian Religion*. In his *The Christian Sacraments* Dr. Kerr offers the reader rich material for study under the following heads: "Our Sacramental [Symbolical] World"; "The Christian Sacraments"; "Baptism in the New Testament"; "The Sacrament of Christian Baptism"; "Who Are to be Baptized?" "The Administration of Baptism"; "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper"; "The Celebration of Holy Communion"; "Special Communion Services"; "The Service Preparatory to the Communion"; "The First Communion"; "Preaching on the Sacraments"; "Is Inter-Communion Possible?" To these thirteen chapters are appended "Notes" and an "Index." There is much in the book which also the Lutheran reader will study with manifest approval. When Dr. Kerr, for example, says (by way of quotation): "The essential thing in the Sacraments is not what we say and do in them, but what God in Christ says and does in them" (p. 23); or: "The Christian Sacraments come to us from the hand of Christ. He institutes the Sacraments and, like the Word of God, they become for us the divine revelation and vehicle of His grace" (Ibid.); or: "They [the Sacraments] alone do what the Word of God does" (p. 30; though this no doubt is said from the Calvinistic viewpoint); or when he advocates and defends Infant Baptism, or refutes the Baptist tenet of immersion, or argues against the Roman Catholic transubstantiation doctrine and the papistic idea of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, or when he delves into church history and brings to light the rich traditions of a pure antiquity on behalf of the truth, or when he advises pastors to preach on the Sacraments, or (not to add more) when he discusses the question: "Is Inter-Communion Possible?" there appear matters which also Lutherans ponder with deep interest. But the fact remains that the author is an honest and outspoken Calvinist, and as such he defends, from beginning to end (though without proper Scripture proof and without refuting the Lutheran doctrine on the point), the symbolic concept of the Sacraments. As nature in general is symbolical (he argues), so also are the Sacraments (though in a special way) symbolical. As Baptism is a symbol, so "the Lord's Supper, in like manner,

is a symbol. The bread and the wine represent our Lord's broken body and shed blood" (p.22). "It is in this sense we experience the Real Presence. The Real Presence is not discovered in the elements, but in Him of whom the elements speak" (p.90). "The body and blood of Christ are not corporally or carnally [?] present in, with, or under the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper; and yet they are spiritually present to the faith of the receiver, no less truly and really than the elements themselves are to their outward senses" (Ibid.). Often the author, compelled by the stringency of the Scripture passages he uses, seems to be on the verge of confessing the Lutheran doctrine of the Sacraments as means of grace, as, for instance, when he says that we are buried with Christ by Baptism into death, or that by Baptism we put on Christ, or when he declares that the Sacraments are signs and seals of God's grace, but he avoids the truth which Scripture forces on the believing Scripture theologian and merely says: "To be baptized 'into Christ' . . . is to be identified with Christ" (p.48). "They [the Sacraments] proclaim the Gospel" (p.28), etc. And just because of his Calvinistic tenet that there are no means of grace in the Lutheran sense, offering, conveying, and sealing the grace of God (remission of sins) to men, he (as other Calvinists) is entirely nonplused with regard to the question as to how the Sacraments can be vehicles, signs, and seals of divine pardon. It is the old Calvinistic error of the immediacy of the divine operation in the hearts of men that prevents the author from placing before his readers the full Gospel truth concerning the essence and efficacy of the Sacraments. There are other matters on which the Lutheran reader cannot agree with his views; as, for example, when he adopts the wrong notion that the Trinitarian Baptismal formula could hardly have been uttered by Jesus Himself, since the Christian Church for many years after the death of Jesus never used that formula at all, but was satisfied to baptize converts into the name of the Lord Jesus alone (p.46). The book therefore must be read with care, especially in such places where, in his expressions, the writer so closely approaches the Lutheran terminology that it would seem as if there were no essential difference between Calvinism and Lutheranism. Nevertheless, for the study of the Reformed view of the Sacraments and for its comparison with the Lutheran doctrine, as set forth, for example, in the Formula of Concord, the book is most useful.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

The Gospel of Saint John Translated into Modern English. By O.M. Norlie. The Life Builders Press, San Antonio, Tex. 152 pages, 3½×5.

It is a difficult undertaking for any one man to render any part of the Bible into modern English, that is, into the language as used by the common man, yet retaining the stateliness which we associate with the Word of God. The present translation of the great "spiritual Gospel," that of the "beloved disciple," shows the trend of the times. It is an attempt, and, on the whole, rather successful, to bring the beauty of the Gospel message to the people of today. It does not seem to the present reviewer that the translator will regard this as the finished and final product. As Luther did between 1521 and 1534, and till the end of his

life, he will want to do a considerable amount of filing. For example, "at supper," chap. 13:1, hardly does justice to the original *δελτρου γινομένου*, "supper being served," which indicates the exact time when the Savior proceeded to the foot washing. The pastor who is making a collection of modern translations (Moffatt, Goodspeed, Weymouth, etc.) will do well to get a copy of this little book. Unfortunately the binding will not stand up well.

P. E. KRETZMANN

Holiness: the False and the True. By H. A. Ironside, Litt. D. Published by Loizeaux Brothers, Bible Truth Depot, New York. 142 pages, 5×7½. Tenth edition. Paper cover 50 cents, cloth \$1.00.

The author was an officer in the Salvation Army during the early years of his life and a strict adherent of the theory of entire sanctification. In the first chapter he describes the doubts, and ultimately the despair, which came to him as a result of this doctrine. In the second part of the book he shows how arbitrarily the Holiness people misuse Scripture in the interest of their pet theory. By placing the doctrine of justification by faith into the center of his presentation, the author successfully refutes the Pentecostals' misuse of Scriptural terms, such as sanctification, perfection, baptism of the Holy Spirit. — The publishers are the agency for the Plymouth Brethren, and the author in several instances speaks of irresistible grace and perseverance in faith, in the same manner in which the Plymouth Brethren, who are strict Calvinists, view these doctrines. But other phases of Plymouth Brethren theology do not become apparent in the book.

F. E. MAYER

On the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons. By John A. Broadus. Published by Harper & Brothers, New York. 392 pages, 8¼×5. \$3.00.

This well-known book on homiletics by Dr. John A. Broadus first appeared in 1870. In 1897 it was revised by Dr. E. C. Dargan, a student of Dr. Broadus and his successor in the Department of Homiletics at the Louisville Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. At that time already the book had been issued in its thirty-seventh edition. Two separate editions were published in England. In 1926 Dr. C. S. Gardner revised the bibliography. Now Dr. Jesse Burton Weatherspoon, also professor of Homiletics and Christian Sociology in the Louisville Seminary, has prepared a new and revised edition, practically, however, reprinting the entire old edition. The book presents a thorough discussion of the homiletical apparatus, including chapters on style and on delivery.

To those who are acquainted with homiletical literature the book of Dr. Broadus need not be recommended, for they know its great value. It has been and still is an outstanding treatise on sermonizing. For this reason we are glad to announce to our readers the revised printing which has been put on the book market.

J. H. C. FRITZ

War, Peace, and Nonresistance. By Guy Franklin Hershberger. The Herald Press, Scottdale, Pennsylvania. 1944. XV and 415 pages, 6×9. \$2.50.

This book is correctly characterized on the publisher's jacket, taken from the author's preface, in which the claim is advanced: "Non-

resistance is a Biblical principle and a way of life, espoused by the Mennonites from the beginning of their history in the time of the Reformation. The present volume has been written in the hope that it may assist the Mennonite people themselves, as well as the general public to a better understanding of their faith and life. . . . Since many forms of pacifism exist today, an attempt has been made to analyze and classify these various types and to show their relation to Biblical non-resistance." (P. ix.) There can be no doubt that the typical Mennonite teaching is here presented, with some effort to prove that position from the Bible. The reviewer was compelled to make many queries on the margin of the book, and that for a number of reasons. Throughout the presentation there is a confusion of ideas: the nonresistance of the individual and the power given by God to the government (and to the police) to avenge evil. There is a mixture of spiritual and temporal matters, as when the concept "peace" is applied to earthly conditions when the peace of the believing heart with God through the Atonement is meant. There is much literalistic application of figurative language. The entire fabric of arguments woven in this book is destroyed by such facts as the Bible presents in Luke 3:14; 1 Pet. 2:13 f.; Titus 3:1. Acts 5:29 clearly applies only where the government commands something which is contrary to a clear word of God, particularly as it may concern the Christian's faith and personal worship. We are ready to recognize the case of the conscientious objector, but the fact remains that he has an erring conscience if he follows the points made in this book.

P. E. KRETZMANN

A Great Time to be Alive. By Harry Emerson Fosdick. Harper & Brothers, New York. 235 pages, 5×7¾. \$2.00.

In this new book Dr. Fosdick offers to the reading public twenty-five sermons, all of which were delivered since Pearl Harbor, one, entitled "Loyalty, the Basic Condition of Liberty," having been preached on the Sunday morning of that fateful day. All these sermons therefore have the present war for their background and deal with problems, personal and public, which the war presents. In abbreviated form the substance of these sermons has been presented over the Blue Network to the radio audience, and the response has been so favorable that this collection of addresses was added to others by the author. The title of the book is the theme of the first sermon, in which Dr. Fosdick, in a special way, seeks to comfort and counsel his large radio and pulpit audience in a time of general perplexity. The preacher speaks with a certain authority—an authority of reason and natural optimism ingrained in the human heart, but he has no enduring consolation to offer to his hearers and readers, since he does not accept the Gospel of Christ and its precious solace for time and eternity. It is not the divine Savior who speaks in these addresses, but a mere man; it is not spiritual trust in the divine promises of grace with which he lightens the path of those who look to him for solace, but a general confidence in an almighty Being and His goodness which we find also in books of pagan thinkers. And yet there is something valuable in these sermons. Dr. Fosdick has a psychological approach that is but rarely found in pulpit orators today, and his is a popular, dignified, simple, convincing style that is

well worth studying. Quite manifestly Dr. Fosdick bestows much time and great industry on the elaboration of his sermons. Every one of the addresses in this book, for example, shows originality of conception, depth of meditation, wide reading, and careful organization for effect. We, of course, do not advocate that Christian ministers should imitate Dr. Fosdick, but there is much (on the formal side) that Christian pastors can learn from these addresses. Dr. Fosdick, the Modernist, is indeed a forceful, effective speaker, a real master of the art of putting across what he has to say.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

Proudly We Hail. By Edward Kuhlmann. The Wartburg Press. Columbus, Ohio. 72 pages. \$1.00. Order from Concordia Publishing House.

In this volume, the widely known author gives us an interpretation of Luther's coat of arms. There are five chapters, headed as follows: I. The Black Cross, an Amazing Paradox; II. A Red Heart, the Supremacy of Love; III. The White Rose, a Partnership with God; IV. The Blue Sky, Catching the Vision; V. A Golden Ring, the Circle We Draw. The author tells us that he first used this material in a series of lectures before a Lutheran Chautauqua. None of its vigor and freshness has been lost in print. The author's usual vivid and stimulating style is evident on every page.

W. G. POLACK

Primary Children Learn at Church. By Ethel L. Smither. Printed for the Leadership Training Publishing Association by Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 170 pages, 5×7½.

This is a typical book in the field of modern religious education. It shows just why so many young and old people, who are members of Christian churches, know so little about the book which should be the very center of their knowledge. In ten chapters the modern approach to religion and religious growth is presented. The "church" of the title is not the meeting or service of the congregation, in which children should be taught to take part, but the church school, that is, the meetings of the children conducted on Sundays, presumably in the church auditorium or the parish house. There are certain individual points in the field of religious psychology which the discriminating reader will be glad to note. But there are many more sections of the book which have no value for the Lutheran Sunday school teacher whatsoever. The Sacrament is to be to the children "a way of remembering Jesus" (p. 33). In a discussion on the preparation for Christmas the author devotes four pages to a plan which includes community needs, a verse-speaking choir to present the poem "In Little Bethlehem," the music to be used, pictures suggestive of Christmas activities and worship. In only one sentence is the suggestion given: "Some of the children may wish to memorize Luke 2:8-14." In one article of the December number of the *School Journal* we have more Christian pedagogy concerning the preparation for Christmas than is given in this book on many pages. With all due respect to subjective impressions the objective certainty of faith based on Scripture must be the first consideration in any church school. One misses the emphasis upon

knowledge unto salvation. There is a notable absence of the truth that the Word of God is a means of grace, in itself efficacious, so that, if the truth is only taught in terms of the child's mental condition, it will work understanding and conviction. According to this book, pupils are pleasantly employed in the classes as here featured. But where is the training referred to in connection with young Timothy's knowing the Scripture from babehood? After reading this book, one is not surprised at the lack of indoctrination in many Protestant churches.

P. E. KRETZMANN

The Lutheran Annual 1945. Published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 244 pages. 25 cents.

Amerikanischer Kalender fuer deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1945 nach der Geburt unsers Herrn Jesu Christi. Same number of pages and same price.

In the foreword to the *Annual* Mr. O. A. Dorn very properly states:

"When a book appears on the market year after year for seventy-six years, it *must* be serving a purpose. And when, in its seventy-fifth year, it is bought in more copies than ever before, we may be sure that more and more people are finding a ready use for the information and the service which it offers.

"With approximately one out of every seven of our communicants away from home, uprooted by the present world emergency, your *Annual* is bound to be of increasing usefulness. On its pages you will find the name and location of every church in the Synodical Conference in this and other lands as well as the name and address of every one of our pastors and teachers—thousands of signposts and highway markers, as it were, gathered from every corner of the country and brought within the compass of a handy booklet! When traveling in 1945, make your *Lutheran Annual* your synodical road map!"

One or the other of these annuals should be in every home of our synodical members.

To Our Subscribers

It has been our custom to retain the names of our subscribers on our lists for two numbers after the subscription has expired, so that the subscriptions could be continued without interruption in case a renewal came in late. We were very happy to follow this plan at extra expense, but we are now unable to continue this policy because of present conditions.

Our Government has insisted that we reduce consumption of paper and eliminate all possible waste. Because of the restriction in the use of paper it will become necessary to discontinue subscriptions to all of our periodicals with the last number paid for under the subscription agreement. We shall, however, continue our policy of reminding our subscribers of the expiration of the subscription by inserting the usual number of notices in the second last and the last numbers of the periodicals they receive. It is our sincere hope that our subscribers will co-operate with us and the Government by renewing their subscriptions promptly upon receipt of the first notice.

June, 1943

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE